CAX
F750

PERKINS LIBRARY

Duke University

Rare Books

THE TRUE HISTORY OF COUNCILS

Enlarged and Defended,

Againſt the Deceits of a pretended Vindicator of the Primitive Church, but indeed of the Tympanite & Tyranny of ſome Prelates many hundred years after Chriſt.

With a Detection of the falſe Hiſtory of *Edward* Lord Biſhop of *Corke* and *Roſſe* in *Ireland*.

And a Specimen of the way by which this Generation confuteth their Adverſaries in ſeveral Inſtances.

And a Preface abbreviating much of *Ludolphus*'s Hiſtory of *Habaſſia*.

Written to ſhew their dangerous Errour, who think that a general Council, or Colledge of Biſhops, is a ſupream Governour of all the Chriſtian World, with power of Univerſal Legiſlation, Judgment and Execution, and that Chriſts Laws without their Univerſal Laws, are not ſufficient for the Churches Unity and Concord.

By RICHARD BAXTER, *a Lover of Truth, Love, and Peace, and a Hater of Lying, Malignity, and Perſecution.*

To which is added by another Hand, a Defence of a Book, Entituled, *No Evidence for Dioceſan Churches.* Wherein what is further produced out of Scripture, and ancient Authors, for Dioceſan Churches, is diſcuſſed.

London, Printed for *Tho. Parkhurſt*, at the Bible and Three Crowns, at the lower end of *Cheapſide*, near *Mercers* Chappel. 1682.

E.
RBR.
B355TH

To the Pious and Peaceable Proteſtant-Conforming Miniſters, who are againſt our Subjection to a Foreign Juriſdiction. The notice of the Reaſon of this Book, with a Breviate of *Ludolphus*'s Habaſſian Hiſtory.

Reverend Brethren,

WHen after the effects of our calamitous diviſions, the rejoycing Nation ſuppoſed they had been united, in our King newly reſtored (by a General and Army which had been fighting againſt him, invited & ſtrengthned by the City, & many others) & an Act of Oblivion ſeemed to have prepared for future amity; ſome little thought that men were about going further from each other than they were before: But the Malady was evident to ſuch of us as were called to attempt a Cure, and neither the Cauſes nor the Prognoſticks hard to be known. A certain and cheap Remedy was obvious; but no Pleas, no Petitions, could get men to accept it. The Symptomes then threatned far worſe than yet hath come to paſs, God being more merciful to us than miſtaken men. We were then judged criminal for foreſeeing and foretelling what Fruit the Seed then ſown would bring forth: And ſince then the Sowers ſay the Foretellers are the cauſe of all. We quickly ſaw, that inſtead of hoping for any Concord, and healing of the Bones which then were broken, it

would become our Care and too hard work, to endeavour to prevent a greater breach. Though we thought Two Thousand such Ministers as were silenced would be mist, when others thought it a blessing to be rid of them, we then feared, and some hoped, that no small number more would follow them.

It was not you that cast such out; nor is it you that wish the continuance and increase of the Causes. We agree with you in all points of the Christian Reformed Religion: and concerning the evil of all the sins which we fear by Conforming to commit, though we agree not of the meaning of those Oaths, Promises, Professions, and Practices, which are the matter feared. We live in unfeigned Love and Communion with those that love Truth, Holiness and Peace, notwithstanding such differences as these. God hath not laid our Salvation or Communion upon our agreeing about the meaning of every word or Sentence in the Bible, much less on our agreeing of the sense of every word in all the Laws and Canons of men.

Two things we earnestly request of you, for the sake of the Christian Religion, this trembling Nation, and your own and others Souls. 1. *That you will in your Parish Relations seriously use your best endeavours to promote true Godliness and Brotherly Love, and to heal the sad Divisions of the Churches: We believe that it must be much by the Parochial Ministers and Assemblies, that Piety and Protestant Verity must be kept up: And what we may not do, we pray that you may do it who are allowed.* 2. *That you will join with us against all* Foreign Jurisdiction, *Ecclesiastical or Civil.*

The Party which we dread I have given you some account of in my Reply to Mr. Dodwell. *By their Fruits you may know them.* 1. *They are such as labour to make our Breaches wider, by rendring those that they dissent from*

from odious, which commonly is by false accusations; They call out for Execution *by the Sword against those that dare not do as they do, and cry,* Go on, abate nothing; they are factious Schismaticks, rebellious: *They might easily have learnt this Language, without staying long in the Universities, and without all the Brimstone Books that teach it them. An invisible Tutor can soon teach it them without Book.* He that hateth his Brother is a murtherer, and hath not eternal Life abiding in him. 2. *They are for an universal humane Government, with power of Legislation and Judgment over the whole Christian World. How to call it they are not yet agreed, whether Aristocratical, or Monarchical, or mixt. Some of them say that it is in the* Collegium Episcoporum, *governing* per Literas formatas, *for fear lest if they say, It is in Councils, they should presently be confuted by the copious Evidence which we produce against them. And yet they may well think that men will ask them [When did all the Bishops on Earth make Laws for all the Christian World, or pass Sentences on Offenders without ever meeting together? And how came they to know each others minds? and which way the major Vote went? And what, and where are those Laws which we must all be governed by, which neither God nor Councils made? The Canons were all made by Councils.*

If you say that I describe men so mad, as that I must be thought to wrong them, I now only ask you, whether our Case be not dismal when such men as you call mad, have power to bring us and keep us in our Divisions; or to do much towards it without much contradiction?

But others who know that such palpable darkness will not serve their cause, do openly say, that it is General Councils which are the Legislative and judging Governours

nours to the whole Church on Earth, as one *Political Body. For they know that we have no other Laws beſides Gods and theirs, pretended to be made for all the World. But when the Caſes opened by me in the Second part of my* Key for Catholicks, *and elſe where, do ſilence them, this Fort alſo is deſerted by them. Even* Albert. Pighius *hath rendred it ridiculous.* 1. *If this be the ſpecifying or unifying Head, or* ſumma Poteſtas *of the Univerſal Church, then it is not monarchical but Ariſtocratical.* 2. *Then the Church is no Church, when for hundreds of Years there are no General Councils, an eſſential part being wanting. And they that own but the* 4 *or* 6 *firſt General Councils, make the Church no Church, or to have been without its eſſentiating Government theſe Thouſand Years. And by what proof, beſides their incredible Word, can they tell the Church, that they are ſubject to the ſix firſt General Councils, and yet not to the ſeventh, eighth, ninth, or any ſince?* 3. *I have oft (againſt* Johnſon, *and elſewhere,) proved that there never was an univerſal Council of all the Churches, but only of part of thoſe in the Roman Empire; Were there no proof but from the recorded Names of the Callers of Councils, and all the Subſcribers, it is unanſwerable.* 4. *Who knows not that the Church is now divided into about Twelve Sects, all condemning one another? And that they are under the Power of various Princes, and many Enemies to Chriſtianity, who will never agree to give them leave to travel to General Councils? And who ſhall call them, or how long time will you give the Biſhops of* Antioch, Alexandria, *the* Jacobites, Abaſſines, Neſtorians, Armenians, Muſcovites, *and all the reſt, to learn ſo much of each others Languages, as to debate intelligibly matters of ſuch moment, as Laws for all the World muſt be. Twenty more ſuch abſurdities, make*

this

this Aristocracy over all the World, as mad a conceit as that forementioned: And when we know already what the Christian Parties hold, and that the said Jacobites, Nestorians, Armenians, Circassians, Mengrelians, Greeks, Muscovites, *&c. are far more than either Protestants or Papists, do we not know that in Councils if they have free Votes they will judge accordingly against both.*

But this sort of men are well aware, that the Church is always, *but* Councils are rare, *and it's, at least, uncertain whether ever there will be more; and the Articles of the Church of* England *say,* They may not be called without the Will of Princes; *and the Church is now under so many contrary Princes as are never like to agree hereto. And they know that some body must call them, and some body must preside,* &c. *Therefore they are forced to speak out, and say, that* the Pope is St. *Peters* Successor, the prime Patriarch, and *principium Unitatis,* and must call Councils, and as President moderate and difference the lawful from the unlawful: *And that in the* Intervals *of Councils he as* Patriarch *is to govern at least the West, and that every* Dioceſane *being* ex Officio, *the* Representer of his Dioceſs, and every Metropolitane of his Province, and every Patriarch of his Patriarchate, what these do all the Bishops on Earth do. *And so the Riddle of a* Collegium Pastorum *is opened, and all cometh but to this, that the* Italians *are* Papists, *who would have the Pope* rule Arbitrarily, *as above Councils; but the* French *are no Papists, who would have the Pope rule only by the Canons or Church Parliaments, and to be* singulis Major, at universis Minor. *This is the true Reformation of Church-Government, in which the English should (by them) agree. And now you know what I am warning you to beware of.*

We are for a twist & conjunction of the civil Power and

and the Ecclesiastical, and for Christian Kingdoms, and Churches, so far national as to be ruled and protected by Christian Kings, in the greatest Love and Concord that can be well obtained: And for Councils necessary to such ends: But we are not for setting up a Foreign Jurisdiction over King and Kingdom, Church and Souls, upon the false claim of uncapable Usurpers. One of your selves in a small Book called, The whole Duty of Nations, *and another,* Dr. *Isaac* Barrow against Papal and all Foreign Jurisdiction, (*published by Dr.* Tillotson) *have spoken our thoughts so fully, as that we only intreat you to take those for our sense, and concurr with us therein for our common Peace and Safety.*

We reverence all Councils so far as they have done good; we are even for the Advice *and* Concord *of* Foreigners; *but not their Jurisdiction.*

If you know the difference between an Assembly of Princes consulting for Peace and Concord, and a Senate to govern all those Princes as their Subjects, you will know the difference between our Reverence *to* Foreign Councils, *and the* Obedience *to them now challenged as the only way to avoid Schism. I hope you will join with us in being called Schismaticks both to* Italian *and* French *Papists.*

The great Instrument of such mens Design being to over-extol Councils *called* General, *and to hide their* Miscarriages, *and so by false History to deceive their credulous party who cannot have while to search after the truth, I took it to be my Duty to tell such men the truth out of the most credible Historians, especially out of the Councils themselves as written by our greatest Adversaries; that they may truly know what such Bishops and Councils have done. Among others this exasperated a Writer, (by fame called Mr.* Morrice,) *who would make men believe that I have wronged Councils and Bishops,*

and

and falsified History: and divers other accusations he brings, to which I have tendered you mine Answer. I have heard men reverence the English *Synods, who yet thought that the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th Excommunicating Canons and the late Engines to cast out 2000 Ministers, proved them such to* England *as I will not denominate. I have heard men reverence the present Ministry and Universities, who yet have said, that they fear more hurt from the worser part of them to* England, *than they should do from an Army of Foreign Enemies whom we might resist.*

I write much, and in great weakness and haste, and have not time for due perusal: And my judgment is rather to do it when I think it necessary, as I can, than not at all: And Mr. M. *would make his Readers believe, when he hath found a word of* Theodorets *hastily mistaken, and* Calami *translated* Quils, *and such matter for a few trifling cavils, that he hath vindicated the Councils and Bishops, and proved me a false Historian.*

And can we have a harder censure of General Councils than his own Reverend Lords and Patrons pass upon them, who tell us that there is but six of all the multitude to be owned. If all the rest are to be rejected, I think the faults of those six may be made known, against their Designs who would bring us under a Foreign Jurisdiction, by the art of over-magnifying General Councils.

I confess these men have great advantage against all that such as I can say; for they have got a sort of Followers who will take their words, and are far from having will or wit impartially themselves to read the Histories and try the case; but will swear that we are all Rogues and Schismaticks, and unfit to be suffered: And they have got young Reverend Priests, who can cry, away with them, execute the Laws; *being conscious how much*

less able they are to confute us, than the Gaoler is: But this is but a Dream: The morning is near, when we shall all awake. Perhaps you remember the jeasting story with which Sagitarius *begins the Preface to his Metaphysicks: Indeed the hysterical suffocating Vapours do ordinarily so work, that in a place of Perfumes or sweetness the Women faint and swoun away as dead; and Castory or Assa Fœtida, called* Stercus Diaboli, *or such like stink, reviveth them like a Cordial. And worse vapours affect the men we speak of: Motions of Love they cannot bear; but reviling and false accusing Books and Speeches are Food and Medicine to them.*

One of my chief Controversies with Mr. M. *is about the Acts and Effects of the Councils of* Ephesus *and* Calcedon, *about the Nestorian and Eutychian and Monothelite Controversies. That the issue was most doleful Divisions of the Christian World, unhealed to this day, is past the denial of sober men. Whether this was long of the Bishops and Councils is the question. I have fully proved that* Nestorius, Cyril, *and* Dioscorus *were all of the same Faith and differed but in wording the same sense: And if so, judge how much the World is beholden to these Councils of Bishops: But this Mr.* M. *taketh for a false Report.*

Because it is our most important difference, I will here give the Reader an account of the Effect of these Councils even to our times, in the great Empire of Habassia, *out of the much praised History of* Job Ludolphus.

Lib. 3. c. 8. *In order to declare the Religion of the* Habassines *he first declareth the Success of the Council of* Calcedon, *thus*,--- [Damnatus Dioscorus Patriarcha Alexandrinus tanquam Eutychis Defensor & Hæresiarcha, verberibus quoque mulctatus & in exilium ejectus fuit, alio Patriarcha Catholico in locum ejus suffecto---

Atrox

Atrox exinde in Ecclesia Alexandrina Schisma, cæde & sanguine continuatum, in causa fuit, ut non solum multo maxima pars Ecclesiæ Alexand. à reliqua Ecclesia Catholica avelleretur, sed & Ægyptus ipsa, attritis incolarum viribus, in Saracenorum potestatem veniret; qui discordiâ Christianorum, utrosque oppresserunt; ut exiguum, proh dolor! vestigium Christianæ Religionis nunc in Ægypto supersit. Hæc atque alia talia Scriptores nostri.

And the loss of Egypt *and the South, so strengthened the Enemies of Christianity, that this breach let in Destruction to the whole Christian Empire: But the loss of the whole Empire and Introduction of Mahometanism, in the Eyes of our fiery Canoneers, is no dishonour to these Councils: It is but saying,* It was all long of *Dioscorus*, and the Hereticks: *And were not these Hereticks also Prelates and Prelatical?*

But he procedeth, [" But the *Æthiopians* thus re-
" port it, that *Dioscorus* and his Successors, and their
" followers did greatly complain of the Injury done
" them; for he neither followed *Eutyches*, nor ever de-
" nied or confounded the Divinity or Humanity really
" existing in Christ, but only was unwilling to acknowledg
" the word [Nature] to be common to the Divinity and
" Humanity of Christ; and only avoided this, lest con-
" trary to the mind of the Catholick Church, and the
" Decrees of the General Council at *Ephesus*, two per-
" sons of Christ should be asserted: For that would fol-
" low, if we admit Two Natures, and two Wills in
" Christ. And the word [φύσις] [*Nature*] signifying som-
" what born or created, no way fitteth the Divinity:
" Nor can the mind conceive of two Wills, in two Na-
" tures united in one person, without Division, Separa-
" tion, or Distance: And the Humane Nature exalted
" into the state of Glory, doth not will, do, or suffer the

 " same

" ſame which it willed, did and ſuffered in the ſtate of " Exinanition; and ſo in the preſent ſtate of Glory, " the humanity doth neither will nor judge any thing " but what the Divinity at once willeth and judgeth. " And this being our known Judgment, the queſtion " ſeemeth idle, and a meer ſtrife of Words, for which " Chriſtians ſhould not have hated one another. At *Cal-* " *cedon* they proceeded from Words to Blows, and " fought more than they diſputed: And *Dioſcorus* was " condemned abſent, neither heard nor well underſtood, " as obſtinate and guilty of Hereſie in Hatred and En- " vy rather than by right.]

This is the Habaſſines *Opinion of the Council and Controverſie, falſe no doubt in our Canoneers Judgment, (for alas they are unlearned men;) but indeed much truer and wiſer than their Adverſaries.*

He proceedeth, 'Primo reperi omni dubio carere, quod 'Habeſſini rejiciunt conſilium Chalcedonenſe--- 2. Ob- 'ſervavi eos in hoc errore eſſe, quaſi Patres Concilii Cal- 'ced. Hypoſtaſin Chriſti dividere, & contra præcedens 'Concilium Epheſinum ex una duas perſonas facere vo- 'luerint--- Hanc ob cauſam damnant Leonem Papam, & 'in cœlum extollunt ſuum Dioſcorum tanquam Ortho- 'doxæ fidei hyperaſpiſten qui juſto zelo diploma Leonis 'ad ſe datum dilaceravit; eumque Martyri aſſimilant, ob 'accepta verbera, excuſſos dentes & evulſam barbam.] (*But it eaſed the Spleen of the Bps. at preſent, and then all the following loſs ſeems tolerable.*)*He addeth,* [4.Con- 'ſtat ex multis locis, quod utrumque abſtractum, Divi- 'nitatem & Humanitatem, conjunctim in Chriſto aperte 'confiteantur. Quid autem hoc aliud eſt, quam agnoſce- 're duas ſimul naturas in Chriſto. 5. Tellezius ex Rela- 'tione Patrum ſocietatis teſtatur [utramque naturam] 'reperiri in eorum libris. 6. *He ſhews that the Habaſſines*

'*words*

'*words have various signification, and by* two natures, 'they mean two Persons. Which (*saith* Ludolphus) when I 'read and consider, I find all to be confused and per- 'plexed: There is no certain state of the question, and 'the words are out of measure equivocal. Perhaps *Eu-* '*tyches* himself could not tell what sort of Nature was 'made of two, and what was its name, and what was its 'qualities: But that he was such a fool as to think that 'the Natures in Christ were so confused as Water is with 'Wine, and that in so absurd an Opinion he had most 'wise men agreeing with him; this almost exceedeth all 'belief: Certainly the *Ethiopians* are not guilty of so 'gross a Heresie. Wherefore I confess I cannot under- 'stand what those frequent Disputations were, which 'the Jesuits had with the Habassines, of two Natures in 'Christ, in which they say they had still the worse, be- 'ing convicted by their own Books, which I easily believe, 'seeing they most willingly confess Christs Divinity and 'Humanity. To me it seemeth likely only that they 'could not agree in words. Do but explain to them that by 'Natures in Christ we mean his Divinity and Humanity; '& then ask them which Nature is it that faileth in Christ. 'Most certainly they will answer that neither the Divi- 'vinity nor Humanity failed, but both continue eternal- 'ly. And so it's plain, that they take the word Nature 'in a far other sense than we, and that the true state of 'the question with them is, whether and by what com- 'mon Name the two abstracts are to be denominated; 'which they undoubtedly confess.

Now good Mr. Morice, (*with your Lords*) *you must pardon me,* (*or choose*) *for thinking that* it is not necessary to Salvation, or to keep the Church from utter confusion, *to be such Criticks in Grammar or Metaphysicks, as to resolve the questions about the sence of* Nature,

ture, *and* Unity, *or* Duality, *which you no better resolve your selves; I say, it is not necessary by Gods Law, but by the Councils: And if I be a Schismatick for holding that Christs Universal Law is so sufficient for his Church, as that a Legislative Power in Councils to make such Laws as shall tear all to pieces the Churches for* 1300 *Years, and teach our Holy Fathers to damn Millions of the Innocent, is not either necessary or desireable; a Schismatick I will continue.*

Ludolphus *proceeding to open the ambiguity of the words, addeth,* [' A famous Country-man of ours, who ' *anno* 1634. dwelling in *Egypt*, read the Books of the ' Cophties (*Pet. Heylin* of *Lubeck.*) judged that [the ' Dissent of the Parties was more in their fear of the Se- ' quele, than in the matter itself: For the *Greeks* would ' obviate the Hereticks who confound Christs Divinity ' and Humanity: And the Cophties those who feign two ' Persons in Christ.] And if indeed this be the case, that ' the Fight either of old was, or still is only about the ' sense of words; verily no kind of Tears can be so sharp, as ' to suffice to weep for this unhappy Word-War; No Breast ' can be so hard which would not mourn for the unhappy ' Contentions of them, to whom Christ by his own ex- ' ample solicitously commended the strictest Bond of Cha- ' rity: No mind can be so cruel, which for the name of ' [*Nature*] would loose the knot of Concord between ' those whose Nature the eternal Word assumeth into ' his most sacred Hypostasis.]

Fie, Mr. Ludolphus, *can you so well describe* Ethiopia, *and no better know your Neighbours? Come into* England *and you may soon know the Reverend and Right Reverend, who will not only defend this Councils Acts, and condemn those that be not of their mind, but are ready to do the like themselves, and triumph over the thousands*

silenced

silenced, as they judge, for lesser things; yea, and make that Councils Canons such a Law to the Universal Church, as that all are Schismaticks that obey it not.

But Ludolphus *yet considering, addeth,* [But such is the Infirmity of our most corrupt Nature, that where once Ambition hath begun, and from Ambition Emulation, and from Emulation Envy, and from Envy Hatred, the mind possessed with (such) affections, no more perceiveth Truth, but as with Ears and Eyes shut up, neither heareth nor seeth, how or with what mind any thing is spoken or written by the other side.

O Sir, now I perceive you understand more than you seemed to do.

But yet the History is behind. The Pope hath long had a great desire to be the Church Governour of Habassia, *but could never come to know it, much less to bear Rule over it. At last the* Portugals *getting possession of some Maritime parts, whence with much difficulty it was possible to come to them, the Pope got them to help the* Habassines *in a dangerous War which they had against their Neighbour* Mahometanes *and* Heathens, *on condition that the* Habassines *would receive a Patriarch and Jesuites from* Rome: *The* Portugals *Guns, (which that Country had not) and their own necessity, made the* Habassines *consent: The* Roman *Patriarch and Jesuits came over. The custom of* Habassia *had long been to receive a Metropolitan called their* Abuna, *from the Patriarch of* Alexandria, *who being a poor unlearned Subject, and almost Slave to the* Turk, *made* Abunas *and Priests as unlearned as himself: when the Jesuits came furnished with Arts and Sciences, the matter came to long Disputes; for the People, especially the Monks and the Rulers, were loth to change their old accustomed Religion, called the* Alexandrian, *for that called the Romane:*

The

The King would needs have it done by hearing both parties speak: But the learned Jesuites were still too hard for the unlearned Habassines: One King seemed to like the Romanes, but his Son (Claudius) *stiffly resisted them: Others afterward again needed help, and received them, and by their Disputes seemed really to be for them, seeing how much the Jesuites excelled their Priests; specially K.* Zadengelus, *being taken with the Jesuits Preaching, when all his own Clergy only read Liturgies & Homilies, & never preacht: He set up the Romane Patriarch & power, & K.* Susneus *after him sware Obedience to the Pope, and resolutely established Popery:* Disputes *brought him to it: And the Jesuites knowing that it must be somthing which seemed to be of Weight, which must make the Empire submit to a Change of their Religion, accuse the* Abassines *as erring with the* Eutychians, *in rejecting the Council of* Calcedon, *and denying two* Natures *and* Wills *in Christ. This was chosen as the main Subject of the great Disputes: The Emperour was convinced of their Heresie, and became a resolute Proselite to* Rome: *And Popery Eight Years had the upper ruling hand.*

But all this while the Empire was in discontent: The Royal Family and the Sub-Governours oft broke out into Rebellion. To be short, many bloody battels were fought. The Emperour usually had the Victory: But when one field of blood was dried up, a new Rebellion still Sprung up. The Papists still told the K. that God gave him the Victory for owning his Church and Cause. His Rulers, Priests, and Monks told him he killed his Subjects, and in the end would lose his Empire for nothing but bare words. After many fights in the last about Eight Thousand of his Subjects called his Enemies, were killed: The Kings own adherents being no friends to the Roman Change, desired the King to view the dead, and made to him presently

this Speech: 'The ſe were not Heathens nor Mahometanes, 'in whoſe death we might juſtly rejoice: They were Chri-'ſtians; they were formerly your Subjects, our Countrymen, 'and near in Body ſome of them to you, and ſome to us: 'How much better might ſo many valiant Breaſts have 'been ſet againſt the deadly Enemies of your Kingdom. 'It's no victory which is got upon Citizens; with the 'Sword by which you kill them, you ſtab your ſelf. Thoſe 'whom we perſecute with ſo terrible a War do not hate 'us, but only are againſt that Worſhip which we force 'them to: How many have we already killed for the 'changing of Religion (*Sacrorum*?) How many more 'are there yet to be killed? What end will there be of 'Fighting? Give over we beſeech you, to drive them to 'your new Religious things (*nova ſacra*,) leſt they give 'over to obey you, elſe there will never be a ſafe peace.] *Yea, the Kings eldeſt Son and his Brother got the* Gallans (*Heathens*,) *that had been Souldiers for the King, to tell him they would fight againſt his Diſſenting Chriſtians no more. The K. growing weary of War, and ſeeing and hearing all this, changed his mind, and called a Council, in which it was agreed*, [That the Alexandrian Religion ſhould be reſtored: And to effect this they declared, that indeed the Roman Religion was the very ſame: Both ſaid that Chriſt is true God and true Man: And to ſay, There is one Nature, or there are two, are words of ſmall moment, and not worthy the ruining of the Empire,] And thus the King was brought to give Liberty of Religion to the Diſſenters.

The Romane Patriarch underſtanding all this, goeth with the Biſhop and Jeſuits to the King, *and made this Speech to him*, ['I thought we had been lately Conque-'rours, but behold we are conquered: The Rebels that 'were conquered have obtained that which they deſired:

'Before the Fight was the time of Vowing and Promising, 'but now is the time of Performing: The Catholick and 'Portugal Soldiers got the Victory, God prospering the 'Catholick Religion: But now what thanks is given him? 'When it is decreed the other day, that the Alexandri- 'an Religion shall be freely permitted. And here you 'consult not with the Bps. and Religious men, but the 'dull Vulgar, and Gallanes and Mahometanes, yea and 'Women pass Sentence of Religion: Bethink you how 'many Victories you have won against the Rebels since 'you followed the Romane Religion. Remember that it 'was not as constrained by Arms or Fear, but induced by 'free Will, that you embraced it as the truer. Nor did 'we come to you of our own accord, but were sent by 'the Pope of *Rome*, the highest Prelate, and the King of 'Portugal, and this at your Request. Nor did they ever 'intend any thing (against you) but only to join your 'Kingdom to the Church of *Rome*. Take heed therefore 'lest you provoke them to just Indignation: They are 'far off you, but God is near you, and will demand the 'satisfaction which is due to them, you will inure an in- 'delible Blot on the Lyon of the tribe of *Judah*, with 'whom your Ensigns shine; and will imprint a stain on 'your Glory and your Nation: In a word, you will cause 'so many sins by your Apostasie, as, that I may not see 'them, nor the Vengeance of God, which hangeth over 'you, I desire you to command that my Head may be 'presently cut off.] Thus lay the Parriarch, Bp. and Je- suits at the Kings feet in tears.

Readers, Lest you think that I have misranslated, to fit the matter to our times, I intreat the learned to try it by the Original: You see that the things that are, have been, and that sin so blindeth and hardeneth sin- ners, that one Age and Country will take no warning by many others.

You

You see here that the Name and Interest of God and Religion, and the Church may be pleaded by a blind ambitious Clergy, for the murdering of Thousands for a bare difference of Names and Words, and Gods Judgments threatned against those that will not go on in killing and destroying, and making Kingdoms desolate by Cruelty: And that the hurt Satan doth by Witches and Highway Robbers, is a Flea-biting in comparison of what he doth by ambitious Prelates and valiant Soldiers. The dismalleſt Story of the ſucceſs of Witches is that of the Swedes *Witches, by Mr.* Hornick *tranſlated; But what is the killing of now and then one, to the Murder of ſo many Thouſands, the Ruine of ſo many Kingdoms, the Silencing of ſo many Thouſand faithful Preachers, the Perſecuting of ſo many Thouſand godly Chriſtians, and the engaging the Chriſtian World in Hatred and War, as the Popiſh Prelates have been guilty of?*

But you'l expect the Anſwer of King Suſneus *to the Patriarch.*

Ludolphus *thus proceedeth,* (li. 3. c. 12.) ['The King 'unmoved briefly anſwereth, that he had done as much 'as he was able, but could do no more. And that the bu-'ſineſs was not about the total change of Religion, but 'only about the grant or (Liberty) of certain Rites (or 'Ceremonies.)

(*O Sir, you had been happier if you had known that ſooner!*)

'The Patriarch anſwered, that he himſelf had indul-'ged ſome things, and was about to indulge more, which 'concern not the ſubſtance of Faith, (*you are for Toleration till the Fires are kindled,*) ſo be it another Edict might be proclaimed, that there might be no other change. The King gave him no other Anſwer, but that the next day he would ſend ſome to treat with the Fathers.

They that were for the Alexandrian Religion go to the Emperour, and by *Abba Athanaſius* requeſt, that by a publick Edict he would allow his Subjects to embrace the Religion of their Anceſtors, elſe the Kingdom would be ruined. The King conſented, and ſent ſome to the Patriarch, to acquaint him with it. Theſe upbraid him with the many defections of the People, '*Ælius*, '*Caabrael*, *Tecla-George*, *Sertzax*, with many *Myriades* 'ſlain: And that the *Laſtenſes* yet fought for the old Re-'ligion, and all ran to them. But the King was deſerted, 'all the *Habaſſines* deſiring their old Religion. But that 'they that would might follow the Roman Religion, '*&c.*

The Papiſts ſeeing that they could get no better but a Toleration, ſent to the King this Anſwer by Emanuel d' Almeyda, *That* ['the Patriarch underſtood, that both 'Religions were tolerated in his Kingdom, and now he 'loved *Ethiopia* equally with his own Country *Portu-'gal*, and would preſently grant as much as might ſtand 'with the purity of Doctrine, (*viz.*,of the two Natures) 'But there muſt be difference made between thoſe who 'had not yet received the Roman Religion, and with 'them they might agree; but thoſe that had given up 'themſelves to it, and had uſed the ſacred Confeſſion 'andCommunion, might not be ſuffered to return to the 'Alexandrian Religion without grievous Sin.] By this temperament the Patriarch would have kept the King and all his Court; for theſe had profeſſed the Roman Religion. But the King weakened with Age and Sickneſs gave them no other Anſwer but, ['But how can that be 'done, for I have not now the Power of the Kingdom?] Home went the Prelates and Jeſuits: And preſently the Trumpets and Drums ſounded, and the Crier proclaimed, ['Oyes, Oyes, (*Hear ye*) We firſt propoſed to you 'the

'the Romane Religion, taking it for good; but an in-
'numerable multitude of men perished, with *Ælius*, *Ca-*
'*brall*, *Tecla-George*, *Sertzaxo*, and with the Country
'*Lastenses*; Wherefore we now grant you the Religion
'of your Ancestors: It shall be lawful hereafter for the
'Alexandrian Clergy to frequent their Churches, and to
'have their *Arculæ* for the Eucharist, and to read their
'Liturgy in the old manner: So farewel, and Rejoice.]

It is incredible with what joy this Edict was received by the People, and how the whole Camps applauded and rejoiced, as if they had been delivered from an invading Enemy, specially the Monks and Clergy having felt the Fathers greatest hatred, did lift up to Heaven their joyful voices: The Vulgar Men and Women danced, the Soldiers prayed all Prosperity to the Emperour: They broke their own Rosaries, and other mens as they met them, and burned some, saying, 'That it was enough for 'them that they BELIEVE CHRIST TO BE TRUE GOD 'and TRUE MAN, and THERE IS NO NEED OF 'DISPUTING ABOUT TWO NATURES, *and so they returned to the old way.*

It's worth the noting here, that the Papists way was cast out as Novelty, and the other kept on the account of Antiquity: For Habassia *never had received the Pope till the* Portugals *came to help them. Yet are they not ashamed here to call theirs the* old Religion, *because when they had banished the old, [which was simple Christianity] we returned to it by Reformation.*

Besides the Doctrine of Two Natures, *about which they saw they agreed in sense, while the Jesuites Heretica ted them, three things much alienated the* Habassines: 1. Denying them the Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds. 2. Rebaptising their Children. 3. Reordaining their Priests.

This

This much being done, the Papists were by degrees soon overcome. 1. *The Patriarch is accused for preaching Sedition.* 2. *Then the Temples are taken from them, and they break their own Images lest the* Habassines *should do it in scorn.* 3. *On* Sept. 16. 1632. *the King died, and his Son* Basilides *was against them.* 4. Ras-Seelaxus *their most powerful friend is banished, and others after him.* 5 *Upon more Accusations their Farmes, Goods, and Guns are seised on.* 6. *They are confined to* Fremona: *Thence they petition again for new Disputations: The King* Basilides *answereth them thus by writing:*

['What I did heretofore was done by my Fathers 'command, whom I must needs obey, so that by his 'conduct I made War against my Kindred and Sub-'jects. But after the last Battle in *Wainadega*, both learn-'ed and unlearned, Clergy and Laity, Civil and Military 'men, great and small, fearlesly said to my Father the 'King, How long shall we be vexed & tired with unprofita-'ble things? How long shall we fight against our Brethren 'and near Friends, cutting off our Right Hand with our 'Left? How long shall we turn our Swords against our 'own Bowels, when yet by the Roman Belief we know 'nothing but what we knew before? For what the Ro-'manes call two Natures in Christ, the Divinity and Hu-'manity, we knew it long ago, from the beginning even 'unto this day: For we all believe that the same Christ 'our Lord is perfect God and perfect Man; perfect God 'in his Divinity, and perfect Man in his Humanity: But 'whereas those Natures are not separated, nor divided, '(for each of them subsisteth, not by itself, but conjunct 'with the other) therefore we say not that they are two 'things, for one is made of two, yet so as that the Na-'tures are not confounded or mixed in his Being. This 'Controversie therefore is of small moment among us:

'Nor

'Nor did we fight much for this; but ſpecially for this 'cauſe, that the Blood was denied the Laity in the Eu-'chariſt, whenas Chriſt himſelf ſaid in the Goſpel, ex-'cept ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his 'Blood ye ſhall not have eternal Life.--- But they deteſt-'ed nothing more than the Reiteration of Baptiſms, as 'if before the Fathers rebaptized us we had been Hea-'thens or Publicanes: And that they Reordained our 'Prieſts and Deacons.--- You too late offer us now that 'which might have been yielded at the firſt; for there is 'now no returning to that which all look at with the 'greateſt horrour and deteſtation, and therefore all fur-'ther Conferences will be in vain.]

In ſhort the Patriarch and all the reſt were utterly baniſhed out of the Empire. Ludolph. l. 3. c. 13.

I add one but thing (ex cap. 14.) *to end the ſtory. As the new Alexandrian* Abuna *was coming out of* Egypt, *the foreſaid Dr.* Peter Heyling *of* Lubeck *being then in* Egypt, *took that opportunity to ſee* Habaſſia, *and went with him: On the Borders at* Suagena *they met the departing Roman Patriarch; where* Peter Heyling *enters the Liſt with him, & ſo handled him as made it appear, that it was only the poor* Habaſſine *Prieſts unlearnedneſs, which had given the Jeſuits their Succeſs: And the Patriarch at the parting, ſighing ſaid to his Company,* If this Doctor come into *Habaſſia*, he will precipitate them into the extreameſt Hereſie. *But what became of him is yet unknown.*

And ſo much for this Hiſtory of the Roman Conqueſt in Habaſſia, *by the* Calcedon *Council, and the Hereticating the* Habaſſines, *about the one or two Natures, and the Eight years poſſeſſion Popery got by it, and the many bloody Battles fought for it, the Prelates powerful Oratory for it, and the Peoples more powerful againſt it;*

the

the Kings mind changed by ſad experience, and the Papiſts finally Extirpated.

And it is exceeding obſervable, that their very Victories were their Ruine, and the laſt and greateſt which killed 8000, *was it that overcame them, when they thought they had done their work. And thoſe that conquered for them drove them out, when they conſidered what they had done: But had it not been better known at a cheaper rate?*

This Tragedy is but the fruit of the Council which Mr. Morrice *juſtifieth: The fruit of a Church determination above* 1200 *years ago. If you had ſeen the Fields of blood in* Habaſſia, *would it not have inclined you to my Opinion againſt Mr.* M. *Or if he had ſeen it, would it not have changed his mind? I doubt it would not, becauſe the Silencings and Calamities in* England *no more move ſuch men; and becauſe they ſtill call for* Execution *againſt thoſe that obey not all their* Oaths *and Ceremonies, and will abate nothing, what ever it may coſt the Land, by the ſtrengthening of them that are for our Diviſion: And becauſe the* 1200 *years experience hath not yet been enough to make them ſee the faultineſs of ſuch Biſhops & Councils, nay, becauſe they yet take not all Gods Laws in Nature and Scripture for ſufficient to Rule the Catholick Church in Religion, without the Laws of theſe ſame Councils, which have had ſuch effects: But ſome Biſhops and Clergy-Men yet ſtand to it, that* All muſt be taken as Schiſmaticks who obey not theſe ſame Councils Decrees, *as the Laws of the Univerſal Church.*

And if Ludolphus *and the* Abaſſines *can ſay ſo much againſt Heretcating thoſe called* Eutychians, *much more may be ſaid for the* Neſtorians, *to prove that the Controverſy was but verbal.*

There is in Biblioth. Pat. To. 6. p. 131. *the* Miſſa quâ utun-

utuntur antiqui Christiani Episcopatus Angamallensis in Montanis Mallabarici Regni apud Indos Orientales, emendata & ab erroribus blasphemiisque Nestorianorum expurgata per Alexium Menesium Archiepiscopum Goanum an. 1599. *I had rather have had it with all its Errours, that we might have truly known how much is genuine. But it being one of the most Scriptural, rational, and well composed Liturgies of all there published: It would make one think,* 1. *That these Nestorians were not so bad a people as their Anathematisers would have made the world believe them.* 2. *That the Banishment of the Nestorians and Eutychians accidentally proved a great means of the Churches enlargement beyond the bounds of the Romane Empire, whither they were banished: And this is plain in current History.*

I have given you this account of my Design in both the Books, (The History of Councils, *with its Vindication, and the following Treatise.) I add an Answer to a Lord Bishop of* Corke *and* Rosse, *who hath written many Historical Untruths by his credulity, believing false Reporters. As to his and others Reprehension of my sharp unpeaceable words, my Case is hard; My own Conscience at once forbids me to justifie my Stile or Passion; and also tells me that if* making odious Gods servants, silencing and persecuting faithful Ministers, and Perjury, *should prove as great a guilt and danger of Destruction to the Land, as is feared, I cannot justifie my long Silence, nor that I use no more plainness and fervency in calling the guilty to Repent.*

The CONTENTS.

I. A *Specimen of the Way by which this Generation confuteth their Adversaries in several Instances.*

II. In the General Part:

§ 1. *Hard for young men to know what Teachers or History to believe.*

§ 7. *Tempting Reasons for Papacy.* § 8. *Evident against it.* § 9. *The Steps by which Bishops ascended to Papacy.*

§ 15. *The different Opinions of Popery in the* English.

§ 18. *The Case of Fact discerned, what Judgment I settled in about Church-Power.*

§ 20. *For what Mr.* M. *hath wrote with so much displeasure against me.*

§ 22. *Instances of above an Hundred Councils, besides particular Bishops, all before* An. 1050. *of whom I appeal to the Consciences of all sober Men, whether they have not been the Tearers of the Church.*

General Instances of the greater Schisms since then by popish Bps.

Some Questions put to Mr. M. *and some Reasons to abate his displeasure.*

§ 22. *Of a late Book of the History of my Life, to prove me the worst of men.*

§ 24. *Whether I be guilty of falsifying History.*

III. The particular Answer to Mr. *M's* Vindication.

Ch. 1. *The Reason and Design of my History of the Schisms of Bishops and Councils.*

Ch. 2. *Whether we ought to tell of the Bishops and Councils Church-corrupting Ways.*

Ch. 3. *Of Mr.* M's *Industry to shew me to be unlearned.*

Ch. 4. *Whether I vainly name Historians which I never read.*

Ch. 5. *Of my use of Translations, and following* Binnius.

Ch. 6. *His charge of my own mistranslations and mistakes.*

Ch. 7. *His false Supposition that I am only for a Church of one Congregation.*

Ch. 8. *His false Supposition that I am against* Dioceſanes, *when it's only the ill species.*

Ch. 9. *And that I am a Independent, and yet plead for Presbyterians.*

Ch. 10. *His false Accusation that I make the Bishops the cause of all Heresies and Schisms.*

Ch. 11. *And that I mention all the Bishops Faults and none of their Goodness.*

Ch. 12. *His Accusation of Spite, Malice, and Railing examined, Dr.* Burnet *satisfied.*

Ch. 13. *His Supposition that I speak against all Bishops Councils.*

Ch. 14. *Some mens Credit about ancient History, tried by their History of this Age. Twenty Instances of the History of our times. My own experience of it. Whether I hate compliance with Superiours, or to preach by Licence.*

Ch. 15. *Mr.* M's *Magisterial authorising or rejecting what Historians he pleases. His Accusation of* Socrates *and* Sozomene, *and valuing* Valesius, Sirmond, *&c.*

Ch. 16. *His Observation on my Notes of credible and incredible History. His Instances of my Railing particularly considered. Whether the word* [Hereticating] *be railing or causeless. An Instance of Fifty five of Bp. St.* Philastrius's *accused Heresies, by which I desire any sober man to judge. Other Instances. Whether St.* Theophilus, *or* Socrates *and* Sozomene *were the Criminals. Even Pope* Honorius *and* Vigilius *hereticated for being wiser than other Popes.*

Ch. 17. *Of his Censure of my Design and Church-Principles: Whether I be guilty of exposing Christianity more than* Julian *&* Lucian.

Ch. 18. *Of his* 2d *Chap. Who is most against Discipline. Of Anathematising. Whether* Novatus *was a Bishop or an ordaining Presbyter. Councils for rebaptising. His Self-contradictions. Some Questions to him. Whether the* Diocesane *Party (as Mr.* Dodwel) *who nullifie our Sacraments, are Heretick, if the Re-baptisers were such. The old qu. was not of Rebaptising Hereticks, but of such as Hereticks had baptised. Of the* Donatists *and many Councils. Of our Liturgy's Rule to find* Easter-day. *What the* Novatians *held.* Petavius *and* Albaspineus *Testimony of them. His quarrels about* Epiphanius, *the* Arians, *the* Audians *divers Synods.* Antioch. *Of the* Circumcellians. Optatus *of the* Donatists *as Brethren. His Excuse of the Bishops.*

Ch. 19. *Of the 1st General Council at* C. P. *Whether Bishops followed Emperours. Their usage of* Greg. Nazianz. . *Of the* Priscillianists, *the Bishops, and* Martin. *Of my Letter to Dr.* Hill. *Of the Council at* Capua. Jovinian, Easter, African *Bps.* Donatists. Theophilus. *Altars.*

Ch. 20.

Ch. 20. *His* 5 *Chap. Of the* 1*ſt* Epheſ. *Council. His reviling* Socrates *and* Sozomene, *as againſt* Cyril. Cyrils *Story. Of the Presbyterians Cruelty.* Neſtorius *Caſe. His cavils againſt my Tranſlations. The effects of that Council at this day conſidered.*

Ch. 21. *Of the* 2*d* Epheſ. *Council. Of* Cyril, *the* Eutychians, *and* Dioſcorus.

Ch. 22. *Of the* Calcedon *Council:* Pulcheria *and* Eudocia. *What one ſound man can do in a Council. Whether our late Conciliatory Endeavours about* Arminianiſm, *have been as vain as theſe Councils. Of* Theodoſ. 2. *and the* Eutychians. *The whole ſtory of that Council.* Luther *as well as I, makes the Controverſie verbal. Of the Biſhops* Peccavimus: *Many Accuſations reſelled: More of the Councils Succeſſes, and late Conciliators. The* Weſtminſter *Synod. Mr.* M's *way of Concord. Of the old Conformity and ours. Mr.* Edwards *Gangrena, and the late Sects and Hereſies.*

Ch. 24. *Of his 7th Chapter. Of the old Hereſies. Whether Projects for Moderation have been the chief diſtracters of the Church. He oft falſly ſaith, that I charge the Biſhops with all the hereſies in the world. What it is that I ſay of them. The true cauſe of Schiſm confeſſed. His miſreports of the cauſe and Biſhops. His falſe ſaying of me that I compared* Oliver *and his ſon to* David *and* Solomon *My profeſt Repentance which he feigneth me an Enemy to. What Nonconformity is, and what his miſreports of it. An explicatory profeſſion of the meaning of this Book againſt Miſinterpreters.*

THE

THE

Ready Way

OF

Confuting Mr. Baxter,

A

SPECIMEN

OF THE

PRESENT MODE

OF

Controverſie in England.

Joh. 8. 44. 1 *King.* 22. 22. *Prov.* 29. 12. & 19. 5, 9. *Rev.* 21. 8. & 22. 15.

IN 1662. Dr. *Boreman* of *Trinity-Colledge* in *Cambridge*, Publiſhed a Book againſt me, as having written to Dr. *Hill* againſt *Phyſical-Predetermination to Sin*; and in it ſaith, That it is reported, *That I kill'd a Man with my own Hand in cold Blood; and if it be not true, I am not the firſt that have been wronged.* The Man, though promoted to the Charge of this Pariſh, St. *Giles in the Fields*,

was accounted so weak, (forbearing his Ministry, and saying he was suspended some Years before he died) that I thought it vain to take publick Notice of his Words; neither imagining whence he had them, nor ever hearing of them before.

But a few Weeks before the late *Plot* was reported, one Mr. *P.* came to me, and told me, That at the Coffee-House in *Fullers-Rents*, where *Papists* and *Protestants* used familiarly to meet; he provoking the *Papists* to Answer my Books, or to Dispute with me, was answered by a Gentleman of this Parish, said to be of the Church of *England*, That [*Mr.* Baxter *had kill'd a Man in cold Blood with his own Hand.*] Mr. *P.* provoked him by a Wager to make it good. He refusing the Wager, was told, He should hear of it publickly, unless he would ask me Forgiveness. After some time, the Gentleman came to me with Mr. *Tasborough*, (since imprisoned, as is known) and with great Civility, ask't me Forgiveness. He was the Son of a Knight, and Judge, of my Acquaintance; and had an Aunt, that had been my very dear Friend. I told him, That Slandering is so common, and asking Forgiveness so rare, that I took it for a note of great Ingenuity in him; and, as I must forgive all Men as a Christian, so I could easily forgive any wrong to one related to such a Friend of mine. He told me, He was resolved openly to confess his Fault, and to vindicate me on all Occasions.

Accordingly, at the same Coffee-House, he openly declared his Repentance. Upon which, Mr. *P.* tells me, That Mr. *G.* an Aged Lawyer, Brother to the Lady *Ab.* was displeased, and said, He would prove the thing true by many Witnesses: (And, saith Mr. *P.* the Story among some of them was, That a Tinker did beat his Kettle at my Door, and being disturbed by him, I pistoll'd him, and was tryed for my Life at *Worcester.*) Mr. *P.* said, He provoked Mr. *G.* to lay a Wager on it: And he refusing, was told, [*Then he should hear of it in Westminster-Hall.*] Upon this, saith Mr. *P.* his Fellow-*Catholicks* ingeniously resolved to disown him, unless he would ask Forgiveness; which he being unwilling to come to me to do, Mr. *P.* saith, He at last performed before *Him*, and Capt. *Edmund Hampden.*

All this being done without my Knowledge (till after,) I was relating it to Mr. *John Humfrey*: *Why* (saith he) *I did twelve Years ago hear Dr.* Allestry, *now Regius-Professor in* Oxford, *say the like, That he could not think well of that Man, that had kill'd a Man in cold Blood with his own Hand.*

I little

I little regarded all the reſt: But Dr. *Alleſtry* had many Years been my old School-Fellow; many a time I had taught him; and he was the beſt at Learning, and of the honeſteſt Diſpoſition of any Boy that ever I knew; and I thought, if *Parties* could draw ſuch as he into ſuch Guilt, there was little Account to be made of the Reports or Hiſtory of Men, if once they fell into different Factions. Wherefore I wrote to him what Mr. *Humfrey* told me, and received from him this honeſt ingenuous Letter, which I here annex.

And as to all this Story, I do here ſolemnly profeſs, That I never killed, wounded, or hurt any Man in my Life, (ſave one Man, whoſe Leg I hurt with playful Wreſtling, when I was a Boy, and once or twice boxing with School-Boys, and correcting Lads when I was one Year a School-Maſter.) Nor in all the Wars, or in my Life, did I ever ſee any other kill any Man, ſave one; and that was at the ſame Bickering, (about Forty of a Side) when *Jennings* was wounded: While they were Fighting with him in one great Field, I being in another near the Houſe, ſaw the Souldiers offering Quarter to a Foot-Souldier, and promiſing him Safety, if he would lay down his Musket; which he did not, but ſtruck at them; and Captain *Holdich* ſhot him dead: And it proved after to be a *Welſh*-man, that underſtood not *Engliſh*; which grieved them when they knew it.

I have gone the next day where Fights have been, and ſeen many dead, when I had nothing to do with the Armies of either Part. But I never ſaw any, to my Knowledge, kill or hurt any Man, but this one.

Dr. *Alleſtry*'s Letter: (Which I ſhould not Publiſh, but that even in *Oxford*, and elſewhere among the Clergy, the Report yet goeth on.)

SIR,

I *Muſt profeſs ſincerely, That I cannot recollect I ever ſaid ſuch Words of you to Mr.* Humfrey, *as it ſeems he does affirm I did: But yet I cannot but acknowledge, it is very poſſible, that I related, (and may be, to Him) That I had heard, you kill'd a Man in cold Blood: Since I very well remember, that above Thirty Years ſince, at the End of the War, I heard that publickly,*

lickly spoken before Company; and with this farther Circumstance, that it was a Souldier, who had been a Prisoner some Hours. Now this Report relating to the Wars, in which (I fear) such Things were no great Rarities, and from my very tender Youth, I having not had the least Converse with you, nor likely of any for the future, did not therefore apprehend, at present, any Concern or Occasion of inquiring, whether it were true; of which, upon that confident Asseveration, I did make no doubt. And I took so little thought of laying up the Relation, that I protest to you, as in the Presence of Almighty God, *it is impossible for me to recover, who made up that Company in which I heard it, or from whom I heard it: And I wonder, how it came into my Mind, to say that I had heard it, so long after. But however, though it be some Ease to me, to believe the late Discourses of it, do not come from my relating so long since that I heard it, neither are likely to receive any Confirmation from it, unless it be made more Publick than I have made it; yet I do profess, it is a great Affliction to me, to have spoken that, though but as a Report, which (it seems) was a Slander, (for so I believe it, upon your Asseveration) and not having endeavoured to know whether it were true. And, as I have beg'd* God's *Forgiveness of it; so I heartily desire, You will forgive me: And if I could direct my self to any other way of Satisfaction, I would give it. This is the whole Account I can give of this Matter; to which I shall only add, That I am,*

Eaton-Coll. Dec. 13. 1679.

SIR,

Your very Affectionate Servant,

Richard Alleſtry.

II. In the Preface to the Life of Dr. *Heylin* are these Words. *Mr.* Baxter *may be pleased to call to mind, what was done to one Major* Jennings, *the last War, in that Fight that was between* Lyndsel *and* Longford, *in the County of* Salop; *where the* Kings *Party, having unfortunately the worst of the Day, the poor Man was stript almost naked, and left for*

for dead in the Field: But Mr. Baxter, *and one Lieutenant* Hurdman, *taking their Walk among the wounded and dead Bodies, perceived some Life left in the Major, and* Hurdman *run him through the Body in cold Blood; Mr.* Baxter *all the while looking on, and taking off with his own Hand, the* Kings *Picture from about his Neck; telling him, as he was swiming in his Goar, That he was a Popish Rogue, and that was his Crucifix: Which Picture was kept by Mr.* Baxter *for many Years, till it was got from him (but not without much difficulty) by one Mr.* Somerfield, *who then lived with* Sir Thomas Rous, *and generously restored it to the poor man, now alive at* Wick *near* Pershore *in* Worcestershire, *although at the Fight supposed to be dead: being, after the Wounds given him, drag'd up and down the Field by the merciless Souldiers; Mr.* Baxter *approving of the inhumanity, by feeding his Eyes with so bloody, and so barbarous a Spectacle.*

I Thomas Jennings, *Subscribe to the truth of this Narrative abovementioned; and have hereunto put my Hand and Seal this second Day of* March 1682. Thomas Jennings. *Signed and Sealed,* March 2. 1682. *in the Presence of* John Clark, *Minister of* Wick, Thomas Dacke. *Published by* George Vernon, *Minister.*

The like was before Published by *Roger L'Strange.*

Answ. I do not think Major *Jennings* knowingly made this Lye, but was directed by some bodies Report, and my sending him the *Medal.* I do solemnly protest, 1. That, to my Knowledge, I never saw Major *Jennings:* 2. That I never saw Man wound, hurt, strip, or touch him: 3. That I never spake a word to him, much less any word here affirmed: 4. That I neither took the Picture from about his Neck, nor saw who did it: 5. That I was not in the Field, when it was done: 6. That I walked not among any wounded or dead; nor heard of any kild, but the one Man before-mentioned. 7. That the Picture was never got from me with difficulty. But that this is the Truth: The *Parliament* had a few Men in *Longford* House, and the *King* at *Lyndsel*, about a Mile and a half a-sunder; who used oft to skirmish, and dare each other in the Fields between: My Innocent Father being Prisoner at *Lyndsel*, and I being at *Longford*, resolved not to go thence till he was delivered. I saw the Souldiers go out, as they oft did, and in another Field discerned them to meet and Fight: I knew not, that they had seen *Jennings*; but, being in the House, a Souldier shewed a small *Medal* of Guilt Silver, bigger than a Shilling; and told us, That he wounded *Jennings*, and took his Coat, and took that *Medal* from about his Neck: I bought it of him for 18 *d.* no one offering him more. And some Years after (the first time that I heard

I heard where he was, freely desired Mr. *Somerfield* to give it him from me, that had never seen him; supposing it was a mark of Honour, which might be useful to him. And now all these Lies, are all the Thanks that ever I had.

III. The *Observator*, N. 96. saith, [Tor. *Who saith, they (the Presbyterians) brought in the* King, *besides your self?* Wh. *Mr.* Hunt, *the Author of the Conformists Plea, Mr.* Baxter *and who not?*

Tor. *Prethee ask Mr.* Baxter, *If he knows who it was, that went with five or six more of his own Cloth and Character, to General* Monk, *upon his coming up to* London, *in* 1659; *and finding a great deal of Company with him, told his Excellency, That he found his time was precious, and so would not trouble him with many Words: But as they were of great weight, so he hoped, they would make an answerable Impression on him: I hear a Report, Sir,* (saith he) *that you have some thoughts of calling back the* King; *but it is my Sense, and the Sense of these Gentlemen here with me, that it is a thing you ought not to do on any termes: For Prophanness is so inseparable from the Royal Party, that if ever you bring the* King *back, the Power of Godliness will most certainly depart from this Land.*

Answ. Dr. *Manton* (and whether any other, I remember not) went once with me to General *Monk*, and it was to congratulate him; but with this request, That he would take care, *that Debauchery and Contempt of Religion might not be let loose, upon any mens pretence of being for the King, as it already began with some to be.* But there was not one word by me spoken, (or by any one, to my remembrance) *against his calling back the King*, nor any of the rest here adjoyned; but as to me, it is a meer Fiction.

And the *King* was so sensible of the same that I said, that he sent over a Proclamation against such Men, as while they called themselves the *Kings Party*, did live in Debauchery and Prophanness; which Proclamation so rejoyced them that were after *Nonconformists*, that they read it publickly in the Churches. Such gross Falshoods as these, are part of the Evil deprecated.

As to his Question, *Whether the Presbyterians brought in the King?* Who can affirm or deny any thing of equivocal Words? A *Presbyterian* is, who these Men will call such. They that in the Face of the World deny the Publick Acts of Three Kingdoms, in the Age they were done in, no wonder if they multiply the grossest Lies of such as I. The Parties that restored the *King*, were these; 1. The Excluded Members of the *Long Parliament*, the Ministers that were since

since silenced; and the frustrated endeavours of the *Scotch Armies*, and Sir *George Booth*, Sir *Thomas Middleton*, joyning with some of the *Kings* Souldiers, prepared Mens minds to it. 2. General *Monke*, and his Army, who were Fighting against the King a little before, repress *Cromwels* Army. 3. The *Long-Parliament* Members restored, agreed to dissolve themselves, and set up a Council to call home the *King*. 4. Sir *Thomas Allen*, Lord Mayor, and the Aldermen, invited General *Monk* into the City, who joyning with him, turned the Scales. 5. The City Ministers (called *Presbyterians*) perswaded the Lord Mayor to this, and wrote to *Monks* Colonels (called *Presbyterians*) to be for the King: (specially Mr. *Ash*, by Mr. *Calamy*'s Counsel.) 6. The Lord *Mazarine*, Lord *Broghil*, and others of the same Party in *Ireland*, contributed their help; and Colonel *Bridges*, with others, surprized *Dublin* Castle. 7. Many of the Old *Parliament* Men openly provoked *Gen. Monk*, and secretly perswaded and treated with him, to bring in the *King* (whom the Earl of *Anglesey*, the Earl of *Shaftsbury*, and others yet living, can Name to you.) 8. The *Parliament* called by General *Monk*, (by agreement with the *Long-Parliament*,) accounted mostly of the same Party, Voted the *Kings* Return: Which no doubt also, the Old Royalists most earnestly desired, and endeavoured.

This is the Historical Truth; which if in this Age, Men will deny, I will bear any lies that they shall say or swear of me.

Now, either the *foresaid Armies*, *Parliament men*, *Ministers*, &c. *were Presbyterians*, *or not*. *If they were not*; then, 1. Say no more, that it *was Presbyterians that raised War against the King*; but that it was the *Episcopal* Men, if these were such. 2. Why then have you called them *Presbyterians* so long, and do so still? But if *they were Presbyterians*, then it *was such that Restored the King*. But alas, how contemptible, yea, how odious is Truth grown to this Generation!

IV. There is yet a more Famous Historian, than any of these, though unnamed; who pretending to militate after Dr. *Stillingfleet*, as in a 2d. *Part against Separation*, takes on him to give you the History of my Life. Partly making it my Reproach, that when I grew to Understanding, I remembred how many Drunken or Ignorant Readers had been my Teachers: Partly raking up retracted and obliterated Passages of Old Writings; while at once they perswade me to Reviews and Retractations: Partly heaping up abundance of down right Falshoods: Partly clipping Sentences, and leaving out

the

the part that ſhould make them underſtood, and turning true Words, by perverſion, into Falſhoods: And partly by mixing this known Truth, [*That I was on the Parliaments ſide, and openly declared it.*]

But when at the new Model, I ſaw that they changed their Cauſe, I changed my Practice, & was from the Day that I went into the Army, a reſolved Oppoſer of all that they did, to the Changing of the *Government*, & their *Uſurpation*; & was ſent among them to that end; which was immediately after *Naſeby* Fight: And continued openly diſowning the Uſurpation, and the Means that ſet it up. And though I was Preaching and Writing againſt the ſaid Uſurpers, when an Army was Fighting for them, againſt the *King*, and the *King* knew how to forgive and Honour them, that did ſo much to his Reſtoration; yet are the Accuſers ſo far from forgiving thoſe that never perſonally hurt a Man, that they forbear not multiplying falſe Accuſations; yea, and accuſing thoſe Miniſters, and private Men that never had to do with Wars: Yea, the ſame Men that then wrote againſt me for the Changers and Uſurpers, have ſince been the fierce Accuſers of us, that oppoſed them.

And if theſe Men be unſatisfyed of my preſent Judgment, I have no hope of giving them Satisfaction, if all will not do it, which I have largely written in my *Second Plea for Peace, for Loyalty, and againſt Rebellion*; and all my Confutation of *Hooker*'s *Politicks*, in the Laſt Part of my *Chriſtian Directory*; with much more.

But this Book muſt have (if any) a Peculiar Anſwer.

V. Lately, when I taught my Hearers, *That we muſt not make the World believe, that we are under greater Sufferings, than we are, nor be unthankful for our Peace, and that we muſt when any hurt us, love and forgive them, and ſee that we fail not of our Duty to them; but not forſake the owning, and juſt defending by Scripture-Evidence the Truth oppoſed.* They Printed, that I *Bid the People Reſiſt, and not ſtand ſtill, and dye like Dogs.* And I was put the next Day to appeal to many Hundred Hearers, who all knew, that the Accuſation was moſt impudent Lies. This is our preſent Caſe.

VI. The Players, I hope, expect no Anſwer to their Part.

London, Printed for *R. Janeway*, in *Queens-Head-Alley*, in *Pater-Noſter-Row*, 1682.

The General Part containing the Design and Sum of this and the former Book, that it may be understood what it is that Mr. Morrice *defendeth, and opposeth; and what it is that I maintain or blame, and by what Evidence.*

§ 1. I Have been these forty years much troubled with the temptation to wonder, why God suffers most of the World to lie drown'd in Ignorance, Infidelity and Sensuality, and the Church of Professed Christians to live in so great Scandal, Contention, Division, and for the greater number, in a Militant Enmity against the Word, Will, Way, and Servants of Christ, while in Baptism they are Listed under him. But of late since Experience tells me of the marvelous Diversity of Humane Interests and Apprehensions, and the deep Enmity of the Fleshly Mind to Spiritual things, I admire the Wisdom and Providence of God, that there is so much Order, and Peace, and Love in the World of Mankind as there is: And that all men live not as in a continual War. And I perceive that if God had not preserved by Common Grace some remnants of Moral Honesty in the World, and had not also sanctified a peculiar People, whose New Nature is LOVE, the Sons of Men would have been far worse than Bears and Wolves to one another; and a man would have fled with greater fear from the sight of another man, than from a Snake or Tyger. But God hath not left himself without witness, in his Works, and daily Providences, and in the Consciences of those who have not sinned themselves into *Brutes* or *Devils*. And hence it is that there is some

Government and Order in the World, and that ſin is aſhamed of its proper name, and even they that live in Pride, Covetouſneſs, Ambition, Lying, Perſecution, *&c.* cannot endure to hear the name of that which they can endure to keep and practiſe, and cannot endure to forſake.

§ 2. And indeed it is a great Credit to *Honeſty* and *Piety*, to *Truth*, and *Love*, and *Peace*, and *Juſtice*, that the deadlieſt Enemies of them are ambitious of their *Names*; and though they will damn their Souls rather than be ſuch, they will challenge and draw upon any man that denieth them to be ſuch.

And I muſt profeſs, that I fetch hence a great confirmation of the Immortality of Souls, and a Future Life of Retribution. For if there were not a very great difference between Moral Good and Evil, what ſhould make all the world, even the worſt of men, be ſo deſirous to be accounted Good, and ſo impatient of being thought and called *naught*, and as they deſerve. And if the difference be ſo vaſt here, muſt there not needs be a Governour of the World that hath made ſuch a difference by his Laws and Providence, and who will make a greater difference hereafter, when the End and Judgment cometh.

§ 3. Among other Cauſes of Humane Pravity and Confuſion, one is the exceeding difficulty that young men meet with, in the communication of ſo much Knowledge as they muſt neceſſarily receive from others. Knowledge is not born with them: It is but the *power* and *capacity* of it, and not the *act* in which an Infant excels a Dog. And how ſhall they have it but by *Objects* and *Communication*? And *Objects* tell them not things paſt, the Knowledge of which is neceſſary to make them underſtand things preſent, and to come; and without which it is not poſſible to be wiſe. And God teacheth not Men now by Angels ſent from Heaven, but by Men that were taught themſelves before; and by his Spirit bleſſing mens endeavours. And when I have ſaid [*by Man*] how bad, how ſad a creature have I named? Alas! *David's* haſte *Pſal.* 116. was not erroneous paſſion; nor *Paul's* words, *Rom.* 3. a ſlander, when they called all men Lyers, that is untruſty; and ſo little do men know that muſt teach others, and ſo much doth all corruption incline them to love flattering Lies, and to take fleſhly Intereſt, the World, and the Devil for their Teachers, and to hate the Light, becauſe it diſgraceth their hearts and deeds, and ſo much goeth to make a man wiſe,

wiſe, that it muſt be a wonder of merciful Providence that ſhall help young men to Teachers that ſhall not be their Deceivers. There were ever comparatively few that were truly wiſe and truſty, and theſe uſually deſpiſed in the World.

§ 4. And how ſhould young men know who theſe are? This is the grand difficulty that maketh the Errour of the World ſo uncurable. It requireth much wiſdom to know who is wiſe, and to be truſted; who can well diſcern and value that Knowledge in another, which he is a ſtranger to himſelf? Experience tells us, that young unexperienced men do commonly receive that man's Opinions, 1. Who hath by nearneſs, or ſome accident the greateſt advantage in their eſteem and love: 2. Or his that ſpeaks moſt for their fleſhly Intereſt, and for that which they would have to be true: 3. Or his that hath the laſt word. It cannot be expected that they judge of any thing, beyond the advantage of their ſenſes, and the *Notitiæ communes*, according to Evidence of Truth, which muſt be received by long and ſerious ſtudy, and by willing honeſt minds, and by the help of antecedent Verities.

§ 5. In this therefore *Divine free Election* is very manifeſt; As in giving the Goſpel to ſome Nations in the World, when moſt others never have it, ſo in giving ſome young perſons the bleſſing of good Education, and Teachers, and chuſing for them that were unable to chuſe well for themſelves; as alſo in bleſſing the ſame helps to one, which are deſpiſed by another. And verily when I have been long ſtalled with the difficulties about *Election* and *Differencing Grace*, undeniable Experience hath been my chief Conviction. If the Goſpel be true, the common worldly fleſhly ſort, that are for Chriſt but by Tradition, Law and Cuſtom, and are religious for worldly ends, and no farther than the Intereſt of the Fleſh and World will give them leave, have no true *Saving* Grace at all. And the reſt that ſeriouſly believe and ſeek a better Life, and live above fleſhly worldly Intereſts, are in moſt places few, and made the ſcorn and hatred of the reſt. And if *de facto*, God do ſanctifie only a peculiar People, who can deny his differencing Will and Grace?

§ 6. I was my ſelf in my Childhood ignorant what Teachers among ſuch diverſity I ſhould prefer. And firſt God had ſuch a witneſs in my Conſcience, that Virtue and Holineſs were better than *Vice* and *Sin*, that it made me think that the ſort of

Teachers who Traded meerly for the World, and never ſpake a ſerious word of Heaven, nor differed from ſober Heathens, but in Opinion; yea, that endeavoured to make ſerious Godlineſs to ſeem but Hypocriſie, were not like to be the wiſeſt and moſt truſty men. And yet how to judge among the ſerious, which were right, was long too hard for me.

§ 7. When I came to conſider of the Diviſions of the Chriſtian World, and heard the Papiſts pretend to Catholiciſm, and call all others Schiſmaticks or Hereticks, it ſometime ſeemed a plauſible Opinion, that the greateſt Power and Dignity of the Clergy, was the Intereſt of Chriſtianity: By Riches, Honour and Power, they may protect the Godly, and keep Religion from Contempt among the worldly ſort of men, or from oppreſſion at the leaſt.

2. And I ſaw that in all Ages and Countries of the World, Hiſtorians tell us how rare a thing, a wiſe and holy Prince hath been, and how commonly by Wealth and Greatneſs they have been bred up in that Senſuality and Pride, which hath made them the Capital Enemies to ſerious Piety; if not the Perſecutors of it.

3. I thought with my ſelf if ſuch godly Chriſtians, as much value the Intereſt of Religion had lived in ſuch times and places, where Rulers were Perſecutors of the Truth, how glad would they have been to have had the Power of Church-matters put into the hands of their Choſen Paſtors, what would they have deſired more?

4. And I read that till Riches and honours were annexed to the Office, the People had ſtill the Choice of their own Paſtors, and therefore could not chuſe but wiſh their Eſtates and Lives, and all, as well as their Religion, to be as much as might be in their hands. And ſo no doubt when the Biſhops were advanced to great Dioceſſes, and Power, it was by the deſire of the moſt Religious Chriſtians, who valued moſt the Intereſt of the Church.

5. And I could not but obſerve, that though Chriſt gave his Apoſtles no Power of the Sword, he ſet them above other Miniſters, not only in Miraculous Gifts, and Infallible teſtifying and recording his Commands and works, but in ſome ſort of overſight, which ſeemeth a thing appointed for Continuance as well as preaching.

6. And I thought that if Church-Grandure were the Intereſt of Religion and Unity the ſtrength of the Church, it lookt very

plauſibly

plausibly to reason, that as Bishops were over Presbyters, so there should be some over Bishops; and that National Churches should by such Government be hindered from Schism and Heresie as well as Parochial. And that Dioceſans and Metropolitans Power should be derived from a Superiour as well as Presbyters. And that when poor Subjects dare not reprove a Prince, some that are above fearing his Power may.

7. And when I read the Popes Claim, I thought it seemed not improbable, that *Petrus primus*, and *pasce oves meas*, and *super hanc Petram* were not spoken in vain And these thoughts pleaded thus for Church-Grandeur in Prelates and Popes.

§ 8. On the other side, I saw 1. That Christ said, His Kingdom *was not of this world, and comes not* μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, with observable Pomp. And that when they strove who should be *greatest*, he reproved them, and Concluded [*with you it shall not be so*] and that the most serviceable is to be accounted the greatest; that *Peter* himself accordingly describeth their office, 1 *Pet.* 5.

2. I find that Christ appointed them another sort of work to do, even to Preach the Gospel to all Nations through all streights, difficulties and sufferings, and to baptize, and teach Christians to observe the Laws of Christ. And that as he never put the *Sword* into their hand, so an official declaring and applying his Word to voluntary Disciples was all their Office, as ordinary Pastors to be continued.

3. I find that Christ sent them out by two and two, as if it had been done on foresight, that men would erect a Church-Monarchy: And that no Scripture tells us of any division of the Church into Dioceſſes, where one Apostle was a Monarch, or had Power above the rest, or was his Peculiar Province: Nor that the twelve settled twelve such, or any as the seats of their Successors.

4. I find not that ever any one Apostle exercised Government over the rest: Nor that ever Christ gave the rest any Command or Direction to obey any one; Nor that ever the Contending or Schismatical sort of Christians were directed to end their strife, by taking any one for the Head who must determine all their Controversies: And that they that said [*I am of Cephas*] are reproved with the rest. And that all are called Members of the Body, and only Christ the Head. And if it had been his will that *One Universal Head* or *Power* should have been set up as the *Principium*, or Center of Unity, it is a matter of so

great

great conſequence, that it is not to be believed that Chriſt would not have plainly commanded it.

5. I find that Chriſt hath himſelf done the work, for which the neceſſity of *Univerſal Humane Government* (by Pope or Councils) is pretended; *viz.* He hath made and cauſed his Apoſtles (peculiarly qualified for it) to record Univerſal Church-Laws, even as many as are Univerſally neceſſary: And if ſo, I cannot but think, 1. That he hath done it better than Man can do; 2. And that to add more unneceſſarily muſt needs be a ſnare and burden to the Church; 3. And that it muſt be an uſurping the Power of Chriſt: For if there be no other Univerſal Governour, there is no other that hath Authority to make Univerſal Laws. Therefore this is Treaſon againſt Chriſt, and a making Man a Vice-Chriſt.

6. I found that there is not ſo much as a *Natural Capacity* in any one, or many, for an Univerſal Government: Church-Government being of ſuch a nature as maketh it far more impoſſible, than for one Monarch or Ariſtocracy to Govern all the Earth: And to do it by a truly General Council, or by the Diſperſed Biſhops of all the World is further from poſſibility than to do it by a Pope.

7. I ſearcht the Councils pretended to be General, to ſee whether they had made any better Laws than Chriſt's, or made any deſirable addition. And I found 1. That while they were not wholly Papiſts, they never pretended to make Canons for any Chriſtians, but only thoſe in the *Roman* Empire. 2. And that it had been much happier for the Churches if they had made no more Laws than Chriſt had made them, for holy Doctrine, Worſhip, and Church-Diſcipline, and had only as Teachers expounded and applied the Laws of Chriſt.

8. I conſidered the Preſent State of the Church Univerſal, and I find it ſuch as no Party of Chriſtians in the World doth own. The Pope pleadeth for an Univerſal Soveraignty, and all his Clergy do the ſame; ſome ſaying it is in Councils, ſome in the Pope, and moſt in both together, or Councils approved by the Pope: And Proteſtants, Greeks, Neſtorians, Jacobites, and almoſt all other Chriſtians in the World, accuſe this *Roman* Church and Claim.

The Papiſts condemn the reſt: The *Greeks*, *Arminians*, and almoſt all the reſt accuſe each other.

9. I

9. I considered what Popery is, that is, *Clergy-Power* in its height, and what it hath done in the World. And I found 1. A woful description of the lives of multitudes of Popes, recorded by their own most credited Historians. And 2. I found multitudes of vicious Canons obtruded by them as Laws on the Universal Church. 3. I found most doleful Histories of the Wars and Rebellions that they have caused from Age to Age. 4. I found that they have corrupted the Doctrine of Christ in abundance of particulars. 5. And that they have lockt up the Sacred Scriptures from the Vulgar, as they have not done their Canons. 6. And that they have turned God's Spiritual Worship into a multitude of Superstitious Rites, and scenical Ceremonies and Shews. 7. And that they have turned Spiritual Church-Discipline into a secular sort of Tyranny. 8. And that they have most schismatically unchurched the rest of the Churches, because they are not Subjects of the Pope. 9. And that they have branded the soundest Churches with the name of Hereticks, while they are the grand Heresie of the World. 10. And that they have been and are the greatest Silencers of sound Preachers, and hinderers of true Piety and Reformation in the Church. 11. And that they have wofully vitiated the People that are their Subjects, so that odious wickedness fed by Ignorance, abounds among them; and it is their Votaries that are called *Religious*, and a few Canonized persons Saints; as if Religion and *Sanctity* were rarities, or any could be saved without them. 12. Lastly, I find that they have lived upon Blood, like Leeches, and have been the cruellest Persecutors of holy men, on pretence of killing Hereticks: And that it is this to which they trust.

10. I took not this notice of them upon meer prejudice, but have read, I think, as many Papists Books, as Protestants, or any other against them. Nor have I taken it upon dark Scripture Prophecies, suspecting my understanding of them: But 1. The matter of fact from themselves: 2. Against their Papal Supremacy from such Arguments as are fully collected by Dr. *Barrow*. 3. Against their heinous Church-corruptions, from such Moral Evidence as Dr. *H. Moore* hath fully gathered in his *Mystery of Iniquity*. 4. Against their pretences of Tradition and Antiquity, I fetcht my Arguments from the Histories and Authors which they themselves alledge, and especially their Councils, with the Fathers Writings.

§ 9. Seeing

§ 9. Seeing the Church in this ſad Condition, and the Papal part ſo greatly vitiated, I conſidered how long it had ſo been. And I found that the Pope and his Biſhops grew not up like a Muſhroom in a day; but had been long in thriving to maturity: And I met with no man that could juſt tell what Year or what Age the diſeaſe or tumor did begin. Biſhop *Bramhall* thinks if they will abate their laſt 400 years Innovations, we may have hope of agreeing with them. Biſhop *Gunning* will own no General Councils, but the firſt ſix; ſome will receive eight; ſome but four. Mr. *Morrice* here goeth no further in his defence of them, whatever he think. Some begin Popery with *Leo* the great, ſome with *Gregory*'s Succeſſour. But it is moſt certain, that it was firſt an Embrio, and next an Infant and ſo grew up from Childhood to maturity by degrees. And the firſt Church-corruption was not that which we now call Popery. And it is as certain that the tumor did neither begin nor grow up in the Biſhop of *Rome* alone, but in other Biſhops, who grew up with him, & were his ſtrength and Councils, and he their Head.

§ 10. It is known when the *Greeks* and *Romans* began moſt notably to ſtrive which ſhould be greateſt, and how the diviſion increaſed, and when and how it came to an anathematizing or excommunicating each other.

§ 11. It's notorious that it was from the Councils of *Calcedon*, and *Epheſus*, that the great ſeparated bodies of *Neſtorians* and *Eutychians* (now called *Jacobites*) that poſſeſs the *Eaſt* and *South*, were broken off with *Neſtorius* and *Dioſcorus*, and ſo continue to this day.

§ 12. I conſidered who were the Chief Authors of all theſe lamentable Schiſms, and Church-corruptions in the ſeveral Ages when they roſe, and who continue them to this day: And I found that many Princes were much to be blamed, and the People not Innocent, no not the Religious Monks. But the Biſhops that had the main Church-power, by abuſing it, were with their Clergy the principal Cauſes, and ſo are to this day: The breaches might yet be healed in Eaſt, Weſt, and South, were it not for them.

§ 13. Finding this in Hiſtory of undoubted Truth, I next conſidered what was the Cauſe that the Biſhops and their Clergy ſhould become ſuch Church-corrupters and Dividers, and ſtill continue the Churches miſeries.

And

And I found as followeth, 1. That none are able to do so much hurt as those that have the greatest *Parts, Power, Interest* and *Trust*. None kill so many (except Souldiers) as those Physicians who are entrusted to heal and save them. If five hundred neighbours mistake a man's Disease, whom he never trusted, it hurts him not: But an unskilful Nurse or Parent may kill a sick Child; and an unskilful or unfaithful Physician may kill multitudes.

2. And there goeth so much to make a man a skilful, faithful Pastor, as that such are rare. As a Physician is like to kill his Patient, if he mistake but some one thing in his Disease, or some Ingredient in his Medicine, though he were right in all the rest: So if a Guide of Souls were excellent in all other things, what work one Opinion, yea or unskilful word may make, not only the case of the *Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites*, &c. tell us, but even the strife that arose in the Church about *Hypostasis* and *Persona*, which had almost hereticated *Jerom* himself, for all his skill in the Languages: And the case of the Greeks and Latines about [*Filioq;*] and abundance such.

3. And *Pride* is the *Heart* of the Old Man; first living, and last dying. And *great Power, great Parts*, and *great Esteem* do feed it, if true Grace do not mortifie it. Knowledge puffeth up; and especially when men live among the ignorant and unlearned, and are but half Learned themselves, and are thought by the people and themselves, to be much wiser than they are: *Inter cæcos luscus Rex.*

4. And *Selfishness* is the very sum of all positive iniquity: And Pride and Selfishness make men desirous to be the Idols of the World, and to seem as Gods knowing good and evil, and to have their *will* of all that they have to do with.

5. And the strongest temptations use to cause the greatest sins.

§ 14. These Generals presupposed, it is most clear, 1. That the remnant of these sins, even in Christ's Apostles, set them on striving who should be greatest, and made *James* and *John* desire preheminence, and also to have called for *Fire* from Heaven; and made them after Christ's Resurrection, hope that he would have restored the Earthly Kingdom unto *Israel*. And it put *Paul* to vindicate his Apostleship against many that disparaged him; As it made *Diotrephes*, who loved to have the preheminence, to cast out the Brethren, and speak evil of *John*: It gave *Peter* occasion to warn the Bishops not to *Lord it over God's Heritage*,

but to be Examples to the Flock, overseeing them not by constraint, but willingly.

2. Even in good men this fault, though not in a reigning degree, did live more in others afterwards, that had not that measure of the Spirit as the Apostles had to overcome it. And if even in *Paul's* daies he had none like-minded to *Timothy*, who naturally cared for the good of all; for all (too much) sought their own, and not the things that are Jesus Christ's, as *Demas* forsook him for some worldly Interest; what wonder is it if afterward Pride and Worldliness grew greater, and Heresies and Strifes increased.

3. Yet while Christianity was a suffering and laborious State, the Pastors of the Churches were commonly the best men, that had more Knowledge, Holiness and Love than others, and the Churches prospered under the Cross: They that spared not their labours, but imitated the pattern set by *Paul*, *Acts* 20. did not strive who should have the largest Dioceses, and undertake that which they could not do, but they strove to do as much as they were able, and to increase and edifie the Flock.

4. But when extraordinary Gifts abated, and acquired Ones became more necessary, and few Philosophers turned Christians, able Taking Preachers or Orators grew fewer, and those few that were eminent in Knowledge and Speech were justly preferred before the rest. And usually some one man had the chief hand in converting men, and gathering a Church in each particular Town, and then he rightfully was taken for their Pastor: And it being found that the publick and private care of Souls required in each Church, where were fit men, more than one Pastor; 'It was not meet that more should be brought to him that 'was there before, without his approbation and consent; but that 'he were to the *Juniors* as a Father; And because the rest were usually below him in Gifts and Worth, it was thought but meet that they should do what they did by his consent: And also to avoid Divisions, to which they were over-prone, it was judged fit that one should have the preheminence, and a negative, and partly ruling Vote.

5. The Churches, which in the beginning had these Bishops and Fellow-Presbyters, were single Congregations: And shortly they grew to be more than could meet together in some few great Cities; Persecution hindering them from very large Assemblies,

ſemblies, beſides their want of large capacious Temples. Dr. *Hammond* thinks that there is no evidence, that in Scripture-time there were any other Presbyters than Biſhops, and conſequently a Biſhop had but one Congregation, unleſs he went one hour to one, and another to another, which was not their uſe. But doubtleſs in this he is miſtaken, as the many Speakers as *Corinth* ſhew.

6. The Greatneſs of the *Roman* Empire was prepared by God to be then an exceeding great furtherance of the Goſpel: For under the ſame Civil Laws and Powers, where one or two Languages were underſtood by moſt, Chriſtians had the far greater advantage for Communication. Want of forreign Languages is now our great hinderance from Preaching the Goſpel to other Nations of the World: And the Confuſion at *Babel* was an unſpeakable Judgment. But as Ships, yea Navies, can ſail on the Ocean, when ſmall Barks or Boats only can paſs on Rivers; ſo the vaſtneſs of the *Roman* Empire was a great help to the Church, by Communication, Language and Acceſſes: But eſpecially when the Emperour became Chriſtian, the advantage was exceeding great: Whereas now the Greatneſs of the *Turkiſh*, *Tartarian* & *Indoſtan* Empire, are great Impediments to the Goſpel; becauſe the *Barbarians* are more cruel Enemies than the Civil *Romans* (notwithſtanding the ten Perſecutions) were; and their oppoſition is the more extenſive by the extent of their Dominions; and the Chriſtian Churches having now more ſcandalized the Infidels by their corruptions. While they were not corrupted by worldly power and wealth, the great holineſs of the Churches convinced the ſober part of the Empire. *Albaſpineus* ſhews us clearly that their ſtrictneſs was ſo great, that they endured no notable ſcandalous ſin among them; yea and came very near to the *Novatians* in their Diſcipline: And that it was not for greater ſtrictneſs that the *Novatians* were condemned, but for denying the Power of the Church to abſolve men penitent that ſinned after Baptiſm. And their Canons ſhew it. And it is certain, that Chriſtians obeying *Paul*, avoided the Heathen Judicatures as much as might be, and cenſured thoſe that did not, and ended their Differences by the way of Arbitration, and took the Biſhop with the Conſent of his Clergy to be an Authorized Arbitrator; and thus the affairs of all the Chriſtians being caſt upon him, and he having no power to force any

man, but only to govern Volunteers, the Bishops were constrained to make their Rules of Discipline so much the stricter, that all that would not renounce Christianity, and Church-Communion, might be brought to Obedience to escape Excommunication.

7. God having made the *Great Power* and *Extent* of the *Roman* Empire, so great a means for the propagation of Christianity, the Christians thought that the *Greater* they grew themselves, the more it would tend to the Churches deliverance, from contempt and persecution: And their advancement lay in that advancement of the Bishops, which private men could not expect, save only by subsequent participation. Hereupon the Bishops, by the Peoples consent, endeavoured to form the Government of the Church within the Empire, into a conformity to the Government of the Empire: And they contrived that those Cities whose Governours had the chief Civil Power, their Bishops should have answerable Church-Power; the Glory of the Empire drawing them for seeming Interest, into imitation.

8. From the like Principles they desired greatly the enlargement of the Churches of which they were Overseers: And whereas Christ had made single Churches like Schools, and every stated Worshipping Church, was also a Governed Church, as every School hath its School-Masters, one, or more, by degrees these Churches were by degeneration quite altered into other things: First, They were like a Parochial Church, which addeth Chappels: They thought not so contemptibly of the Pastoral work as we do, but found enough, as is said, for many men in a Church of a few hundred or thousand souls: And when by Persecution, or Numbers, or Distance, they could not all meet ordinarily in one place, they appointed them to meet under several Presbyters, in several places, but without appropriating a particular Presbyter to each Assembly.

2. After they appropriated them to their distinct charges, and distinguished a stated Worshipping company from a Governed Church, the Bishop and his Consistory ruling all in common; and the People tyed to communicate only at the Bishops Altar, and elsewhere to be but Hearers and Worshippers.

3. After that they set up Altars up and down for Monuments and Memorials of Martyrs, and then in the Presbyters Chappels; yet so that the People were at *Easter*, *Whitsuntide*, and the *Nativity*,

tivity, to communicate with the Bishop in the Mother Church or Cathedral.

4. Then when Country-Villages distant had a great increase of Christians, they allowed Country-Bishops, *Chorepiscopos*, (proved by *Petavius* to be true Bishops; if they were not, Presbyters ordained.) But they must be subject to the City Bishop. 5. After this they decreed that very little Cities should have no Bishops, *ne vilescat nomen Episcopi*; whenas before that every City had a Bishop and Elders, that had Christians enow: And every Town, like our Corporations, or Market-Towns, were called Cities: πόλις did not signifie only such as we now call Cities distinct from such Towns; were they no bigger than *Cenchrea*, *Majuma*, and such others close to greater Cities, they had Bishops. Yea every Church was to have their Elders, (and consequently Bishops, saith Dr. *Hammond*) where ever it was, by the Rule of the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 14.23. And God never said, Let there be no Churches but in Cities: Else when an Emperour would put down all the Cities, or many, he should put down as many Churches.

6. After this they set up Patriarks as before they had done Metropolitans: And it was three that they first set up (but no where out of the Empire:) And the Papists find in the Institution the mystery of Trinity in Unity: For they could not find any where Twelve Seats Successors to the Twelve Apostles; and so they feigned, that *Peter* being the Center of Unity, The Trinity flowed from him. 1. He as Bishop erected the *Antiochian* Patriarchate. 2. By St. *Mark* his Disciple, the *Alexandrian*. And 3. By his final Episcopacy the *Roman*, saith *Joh. Dartis, de statu Eccles. tempore Apostoli*, pag. 23, 24. [*Imitatur Ecclesia Deum ut trinum in Personis & unum in essentia, quatenus scilicet una & eadem Ecclesia est multiplex ratione locorum; nam distributio prima & generalis omnium Ecclesiarum fuit in tres Patriarchatus, Romanum, Alexandrinum, & Antiochenum, ut unum esset per tres Antistites Sacerdotium ad Trinitatis instar cui una est atque individua potestas ut recte interpretatur Symmachus Pap. ad Eonium--- Dicendum est quod sicut in Trinitate una existente essentia, tamen personæ differentes existunt, ita Ecclesia una est essentia, licet plures particulares existant: Et sicut omnes Trinitatis personæ originem sumunt à Patre, qui est origo Filii, & uterque Sp. Sancti, ita Ecclesia origo est Romana aliarum.*]

7. After

7. At the same time they began to describe Churches or Bishops Provinces by the Measures of Land, which before were described by the Persons of Volunteers, inhabiting near each other, saith the aforesaid *Dartis* p. 128. *Et sane diu duravit ille mos tanquam Apostolicus in Ecclesiis, ut non essent alii termini Episcopatus quam multitudo eorum quos ad fidem convertissent & baptizassent*, which he proveth out of the Canons.

8. *Rome* being the imperial Seat, the Bishop of *Rome* was neareſt the Emperour and subordinate Rulers, and so most capable to make Friends for Christians under any Accusations and Persecutions; by which advantage all Christians through the Empire needing and being glad of such help, did willingly give the Primacy to the *Romane* Patriark.

9. The Emperor *Constantine* turning Christian, and taking them for his sureſt Souldiers, resolved to raise them as high as he well could, for the intereſt of Christianity and his own, and thereby to work down the Heathens by degrees, and accordingly gave them chief Countenance, and chief Power; and their Bishops being their chief men, it must be done by exalting them. He made them the authorized Judges of all Christians that desired it, even in criminal cases. He yet gave not the Bishops the power of the Sword; but if any Christians had committed Fornication, Adultery, Perjury, yea Murder, the Bishop was to punish them by Pennance and Suspension from the Sacrament: Besides which, Christians had the chief Preferments as they were capable of in the Armies and Civil Government: So that they triumphed over their late Persecutors, And now Honour, Power and Wealth, were most on the Christians side, but especially the Bishops.

10. Worldly Intereſt being now on the Churches side, much of the World by such Motives crowded into the Church, and no man can imagine that it could be otherwise, who considers which way the Vulgar go, and how apt to be of the Prince's mind, and how much nature inclineth to fleshly Intereſt: Who had not rather be kept from the Sacrament and Communion for a crime, till he profeſs Repentance, than to be hanged or banished, or ruined for it?

But especially the Temptation was strongeſt to the Bishops, whose baits were the most alluring: And ever since then they that most loved *Wealth*, *Power* and *Honour* (that is, the worſt, most worldly

worldly men) have been the most eager desirers and seekers of Bishopricks: And while humble holy men must rather be sought to, such earnest seekers are like to be the ordinary finders and possessors.

11. But yet three things kept up for some time a considerable number of godly Bishops in the Churches, which with the humble Presbyters, kept up the Interest of sound and practical Religion.

1. Those that had been tryed worthy men before *Constantines* conversion, and the Bishop's exaltation, kept their Integrity in the main; though in the *Nicene* Council their contentious Libels shewed that we are more beholden to *Constantine* than to them, that they fell not into such strife as their Successors did. Good men may be carryed too far in Pride and Strife, but they will not be mastered by them, and turn against the Power of Godliness.

2. The People and Inferiour Clergy had the choice of their Bishops: And so (though they oft had tumults, as in popular Elections it will be) yet the worst ambitious men were long kept out, and the best oft chosen, till the People and Presbyters themselves were corrupted.

3. And divers good Emperours arose that took some care to promote the best: But alas! this had sad and frequent interruptions.

12. For the *Arians* possest *Constantine* himself with hard thoughts of *Athanasius* and his Adherents: And it could not be expected that *Julian* should countenance the best, when *Constantius* and *Valens* had done so much against them, and got most of all the Churches headed by *Arian* Bishops; to say nothing yet of after times.

13. But now two things became matter of Contention among the Bishops and their Clergy, and increased the strife from time to time. The first and chief was the Old *Cause greatly* strengthened, *viz. Who should be greatest?* Who should have the largest, fattest, and most Ruling Dioceses and Seat? The other was, *Who should be taken for the most Orthodox, and whose Explications of the Faith should be taken for the soundest*; especially about the description of the *Person* and *immanent acts of Christ*? Or briefly, 1. Jurisdiction and Greatness: 2. Wisdom and hard words.

14. Now

14. Now also *Constantinople* contended with *Rome*, and being the Seat of the Empire which they judged to be the true Reason of Church-preheminence, they at first modestly took the second place: And now the Trinity of Patriarchs was turned to five, *Jerusalem* being made the fifth. At all this *Rome* grudged.

15. All this while the old Discipline of the Church was tolerably kept up; 1. Because though much of the world had got into the Church, yet a very great part were tenacious of their Heathenish Customs, and prejudiced against Christians by their Contentions, (odiously described by *Am. Marcellinus*, and many others, and prejudiced against *Constantine* for his Son *Crispus* and *Sopaters* death, &c. and against *Constantius* for the Murder of *Julian's* Relations; and being taken with the plausible parts of *Julian*, and with the great Learning and highly extolled Lives of *Plotinus*, *Porphyrius*, *Jamblichus*, *Ædesius*, *Maximus*, *Proeresius*, *Libanius*, *Chrysanthius*, and such others, described by *Eunapius*, &c. so that except *Rome* and *Alexandria*, for 200 years, and some few of the very great Churches for 400, the Churches were no greater than one Bishop and his Consessus, might tolerably govern by the Keys. 2. And all this while all the Presbyters were Church-Governours as well as the Bishop, though he was their Chief, and all Excommunications were to be done by joint consent; And so many Church-Governours may do more than one.

16. Then Councils called General, having by the Emperours Grant, and the Clergies Desire and Consent, the Supreme Church-Power, it was in these Councils that the Pride, Ambition and Domination of all the worldly Prelates that were too soon got in, did exercise it self as the valour and wit of Souldiers in a field of War: And as 1. The good men yet among them; 2. And the Articles of Faith yet retained by them, did cause them to do much good against some Heresies and Disorders, so the Pride and Turbulency, yea ignorance of the rest, caused them to become the occasions of the doleful Schisms, and Heresies; and Enmity of Christians against each other, which continue to this day unhealed.

17. These hurtful Contentions in Councils at first prevailed but little, and that at *Nice* did much more good (I think) than harm: And after at *Constant*: a little more hurt was done, and much good: And those that followed did worse and worse, till the proud worldly Spirit contracted Malignity, and so much prevailed,

prevailed, that for a thousand years at least the Bishops with their Prelatical Clergy and their Councils have been the grand Corruption and Plague of the Church; which many of the most Learned Expositors of the *Revelation*, take to be the *Image of the Beast*; and Dr. *H. Moore* calls it a *Heathenish Christianity*, which they have made their Religion.

18. In their progress to all this, as the Dioceses first grew up from our Parochial Magnitude towards that of the present Diocesan, so the very Pastoral Power of all the rest of the Presbyters, was by degrees taken away, so far as that they had no consenting power in Ordinations or Excommunications, unless the Bishop would chuse a few for his Council: so that the proper power of the King's was confined to one Bishop over many hundred Parishes; and so Discipline became an impossible thing, save as it served the Bishops against some that they disliked: And so the Church which was as the Garden of Christ, became like the Commons, and good and bad were little differenced in Communion.

19. Yet because the Power must still be useful to the Bishops ends, as he sees cause, some shadow of the old exercise must be kept up: But the Bishop having not leisure for the tenth part of the labour which this very shadow required, Lay-men are made his Chancellours to decree Excommunications and Absolutions, and to Govern by the Church Keys; like a secular Court: And Commissaries, Officials, Surrogates, and other hard names and things, are set up instead of the Presbyters and their Antient Office.

20. By this time the Antient Species of the Churches was altered; and whereas it was long held, that a Church and Bishop were Correlates, and there were no more Churches than Bishops, now many hundred or a thousand Parishes are become no Churches, but parts of one Diocesan Church, which is the lowest, and many score or hundred of the old sort of Bishops, all cast out and swallowed up by one. Just as if a thousand, or some hundred *Schools* should have but one Governing Schoolmaster, and be but one School, but each part have an Usher to read to the Boyes, and tell the one Schoolmaster as a Monitor what they did amiss; but might correct none, nor put them out.

21. By this time they began to live on blood; and even as they swelled in the beginning, cruelty grew up equally with

Pride: For Reaſon and Scripture were not on their ſide, nor would juſtifie their Cauſe and them, and therefore violence muſt do it: They deſired not the bare title of *Power*, but the exerciſe of it, to promote the Iſſues of their *Wit* and *Will*. They began with raſh ſilencing, ejecting and depoſing Diſſenters, and thence to anathematizing them, and thence to baniſhing, till at laſt it grew up to tormenting in the Inquiſition, and burning them.

22. And whereas (notwithſtanding the petty Hereſies among Chriſtians too early) the glory of the Antient perſecuted Chriſtians was their entire Love and Concord, and the ſhame of the Philoſophers was their diſcord; it came to that paſs, that whereas a Hereſie of old did ſtart up among a few for a ſmall time, like our Ranters and Quakers, who ſhame Religion no more than Bedlams ſhame Reaſon: Now the great Continents of the Earth have been the Seats of the millions of thoſe called Hereticks and Schiſmaticks by each other, about 1400 or 1300 years. *Euſebius in Præpar. & Demonſtr.* copiouſly ſheweth that the Philoſophers were all confounded in diſſention (and yet did not perſecute each other) but that the Chriſtians were all of one Religion, cleaving to one Sacred Word of God: Of which alſo ſee *Raym. Breganium in Theol. Gent. de Cogn. Dei, Enar.* 5. *cap.* 8. To be Lovers of good men, was the character of the old Biſhops: To be dividers, and haters, and ſlanderers, and ſilencers, and perſecutors, and murderers of them, grew up with corrupters Pride.

23. And with theſe did gradually grow up corruptions of Doctrine, even while they pretended a burning Zeal againſt Hereſie; and corruption of God's publick Worſhip, till it grew up to all the Maſs and *Roman* Impurities.

24. And to ſecure all this againſt Reformation, ridiculous Legends, and falſification of Church-Hiſtory, made it hard for poſterity what to believe, or whom.

§ 15. Being thus far ſure of the matter of fact, by what degrees Prelacy grew up to the height, that it hath now attained in the World abroad, I conſidered what men thought of it now at home (I am ſpeaking yet but of matter of fact;) and I found great diverſity in mens thoughts of it.

1. As to the *Roman* height, I found that the Church of *England* ſince the Reformation till A.B. *Laud*'s time took the Pope to be the Anti-

Antichriſt; It was in their Church-books: Many other Biſhops, as well as Biſhop *Downam*, have written for it: What Biſhop *Morton*, and *Hall*, and *Abbot*, and abundance ſuch have written againſt Popery I need not name.

2. I found that then the ſtream began to turn, and the name of Antichriſt was put out, and our Reconciliation with *Rome* was taken to be a hopeful work, and actually endeavoured (which by their converſion all good men deſire.)

3. I found that many among us of greateſt reverence and name had laid down ſuch tearms as theſe, "[That the Catho-"lick Church is one Viſible Society under one humane Govern-"ing Soveraignty: That this Univerſal Soveraign hath power of "Univerſal Legiſlation and Judgment: That the Colledge of "Biſhops through all the World, are this one Supreme Univer-"ſal Soveraign: That they exerciſe it in General Councils when "they ſit: That every Biſhop is by Office the Repreſentative "of his Dioceſan Church; and theſe Biſhops may, or muſt have "Metropolitans and Patriarchs; and by theſe Patriarchs and "Metropolitans *per literas formatas*, and their *Nuntii the Uni-"verſal Supreme Colledge may exerciſe their Power over all the "World*: And what they do thus, the Church or Colledge doth, "in the intervals of General Councils: That the Pope of "*Rome* is to be acknowledged the *Principium Unitatis* to this "Univerſal Church and Colledge of Biſhops, and the Ordinary "Preſident of General Councils *ex Officio*. That Councils called "without the Preſident who hath the ſole power, are unlawful "Aſſemblies, and puniſhable Routs. That the approbation of "the Preſident, (if not of the moſt of the Patriarchs) is the "note by which an authoriz'd obliging Council is to be known "from others. That the Pope is to be obeyed accordingly as "Prime Patriarch, *Principium Unitatis*, Preſident of General "Councils, and Patriarch of the Weſt. That all that will not "unite with the Church of *Rome* on theſe tearms, are Schiſma-"ticks, and ſo to be accounted and uſed. That thoſe that thus "unite with the Church of *Rome*, are no Papiſts: But a Papiſt "is only one that holdeth all to be juſt and good that is done "by Popes, or at leaſt one that is for the Pope's Abſolute "Power of Governing above Canon-Laws and Church-Parlia-"ments or Councils. And that if they will but abate their laſt "400 years Innovations, or at leaſt not impoſe them on others,

" we may unite with the Church of *Rome*, though they claim " as *Peter's* Succeſſors, the Univerſal Supremacy at leaſt to be " exerciſed according to the Canons of Councils. And that it " is not the Church of *Rome*, but the Court of *Rome*, which at " preſent we may not unite with. That the Church of *Rome* is " a true Church, and hath had an uninterrupted Succeſſion, and " its Sacraments true Sacraments: But none of thoſe Proteſtant " Churches are true Churches, that have not Dioceſan Biſhops; " nor any of their Paſtors true Miniſters of Chriſt, who have not " Dioceſan Epiſcopal Ordination; nor any that have ſuch, unleſs " it hath as ſuch been conveyed down from the Apoſtles by un- " interrupted Succeſſion by ſuch Dioceſans. That ſuch men have " no true Sacraments, God not owning what is done by any not " ſo ordained: That therefore they have no Covenant-promiſe " of, or right to Pardon and Salvation, becauſe ſuch right is " given only by the Sacrament: That therefore all ſuch Pro- " teſtants Sacraments are but nullities, and a prophanation of " holy things: And that the Holy Ghoſt being the Inſtituter of " theſe ſacred things, it is the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt to under- " take and exerciſe the Miniſtry, & celebrate Sacraments without " ſuch uninterrupted ſucceſſive Ordination. That an Ordained " Miniſter, hath no more power than was intended him by his " Ordainers: That in ſuch Presbyterians, or Epiſcopal Churches, " which have their power from the Ordainers, and ſo far for want " of Succeſſion, are nullities; it is ſafe for men (as *e. g.* in *France*) " to be rather of the *Roman* Church than theirs.

§ 16. And as I found this Doctrine in the aſcendent in *England*, ſo I met with ſuch as were for uſing Proteſtants accordingly, even for the ſilencing of them by thouſands, if they would not ſwear, profeſs, promiſe, and do all that —— And for uſing the People accordingly. And abating neither big nor little, an Oath or a Ceremony to unite or ſave them. And I lived in an Age where theſe things were no idle ſpeculations.

§ 17. Being thus far ſure of the Matter of Fact, I ſtudied as well as I was able to know which of theſe waies was right: And I ſaw that either Popery that is, the Popes univerſal Headſhip or Government is of Divine Inſtitution, or elſs it is a heinous Uſurpation, and formeth a ſort of Church which is not on any pretence of Concord to be owned. And as to the firſt I have ſaid before and in many Books what I have to ſay againſt it; which

is

is all summed up in Doctor *Iz. Barrow*, and Doctor *H. Moore*, and largely told the world by *Chamier*, *Sadeel*, *Whitaker*, *Jewel*, *Usher*, *Morton*, *White*, *Chillingworth*, *Crakenthorne*, and abundance more. And I thought it strange if either Papacy, or that Tympanite of the Clergy which tended to it, were of God, that the Persons should be ordinarily so bad, and it should introduce so great mischief in doctrine, worship and practice over the Christian world, and bring the Church into such a divided and polluted state, and that as the Clergy swelled the Body should pine away, and the Spirit of holiness and Love be turned into the Skelleton of Ceremony and Formality, and into hatred, cruelty, and tearing and tormenting pains.

§ 18. Upon all such thoughts I concluded in these resolutions; 1. That I must not accuse any Office made by God, for mens abuse of it. 2. Nor must I accuse the good for the faults of the bad. 3. Nor Confound the Office it self, with its disease, and the accidental Tympanite. 4. Nor aggravate humane infirmities in good men, as if they were the crimes of malignant Enemies. 5. Much less lay any of the blame on Christianity or Piety, when nothing in the world is so much against all these Evils, nor would they have been so far limited, restrained or resisted, had it not been for that Christianity and Piety that was kept up against it; nor is there any other cure of it. It is not by Religion, but for want of more true and serious Religion, that all these mischiefs have so lamentably prevailed.

§ 19. I therefore resolving to avoid extreams, concluded thus; 1. That it is most certain that Christ is the only Head of the Church.

2. And that as such he himself did make universal Laws, and will be the final universal Judge, and there is no other that hath universal Legislative and Judicial Power but he.

3. As such he instituted necessary Church-Officers; first, extraordinary ones to be his Instruments in Legislation, as *Moses* was to the Jews, giving them his Spirit extraordinarily for that use, to bring all that he taught them to their remembrance, and guide them to deliver and record all his Commands: And ordinary Ministers (as the Priests and Levites to the Jews) to teach and apply these Commands, or universal Laws, to the end of the World, but not to add, diminish or alter them.

4. That the formal Essence of this continued Sacred Ministry consisteth

conſiſteth in a derived *Power* and *Obligation* in ſubordination to Chriſt as Prophet, Prieſt and King, to Teach, to Guide the Churches in holy Worſhip, and to Rule them by the Paſtoral Power, which maketh them Miniſterial Judges of mens capacity for Church-Communion; but they have as ſuch no forcing power of the Sword.

5. That there are two ſorts of theſe Miniſters accidentally diſtinguiſhed: 1. Such as are only ordained to the Miniſtry in general, and not ſpecially related to any one particular Church more than other; whoſe work is to do their beſt to Teach Infidels, and baptize them, and gather Churches, and occaſionally to Officiate orderly in ſuch Churches where they come as need their help. 2. Thoſe that have moreover an additional call to be the ſtated Paſtors, Overſeers or Guides of particular Churches as fixed Officers of Chriſt. All which have the three foreſaid Eſſentials of the Office, to Teach, Worſhip and Rule.

6. That the Office of theſe men is to be performed by themſelves, and no Lay-man may do any Eſſential part of them by their deligation, and therefore (as in Phyſicians, Tutors, &c.) neceſſary Perſonal abilities are as eſſential as the neceſſary *diſpoſitio materiæ* is *ad receptionem alicujus formæ*. And *ex quovis ligno non fit mercurius*.

7. That it is very much, and great, and moſt important work, which theſe Miniſters have to do. To Preach God's Word underſtandingly, faithfully, conſtantly, fervently; to reſolve the doubtful, to reprove the ſcandalous, to perſuade the obſtinate, to confute gainſayers, to comfort the ſad, and ſtrengthen the weak, particularly as there is occaſion. To viſit the ſick, Catechize, Baptize, beſides all acts of publick Government. Therefore one man cannot poſſibly do all this for too great a number of ſouls, but great Congregations muſt have many Miniſters: And ſo they had in the Primitive Church, where the moſt able Speakers preacht uſually in publick, and the reſt did more of the perſonal and more private work.

8. And whereas it was very early that moſt ſingle Churches had one that had a preheminence amongſt the reſt (not as of another Office, but as a Preſident in a Colledge of Philoſophers, Phyſicians or Divine Students, to be a Governour over thoſe of his own profeſſion, by moderate Guidance,) and it is not unmeet, that when one worthy Teacher hath gathered a Church,

and

and brought up younger Christians to Ministerial abilities, that they when they are ordained should take him for their Father, I will never gainsay such an Episcopacy in single Churches (that is, societies of Christians combined for personal Communion in Doctrine, Worship and Holy living under such Pastors as aforesaid.)

9. And because I find that the Apostles and Evangelists had a Ministerial care of many Churches to teach, reprove, exhort the Pastors and People; And though the Apostles extraordinary power and work ceased, yet *Church-Oversight* as well as Preaching being an ordinary continued work; and when I find Christ hath instituted some Teachers over many Churches, I dare not say that he hath repealed this till I can prove it. And the nature of the thing tells us, that if some grave holy men have the care of counselling and warning and reproving the Ministers of many Churches who are below them in parts and worth; It may do much good and can do no harm to the Churches, while they have no power of force or tyranny, Therefore I resolved never to speak or do any thing against such Bishops of Bishops, though Diocesan.

§ 20. Thus far I have oft declared my self for Episcopacy: But finding in all the aforesaid History, how the Church came to the woful State that it hath been in these 1200 years, and what it suffereth by the Bishops and their Clergy in almost all parts of the Christian World; and that even the *English* Dioceſans can endure no more Parochial Pastoral Discipline than they do, (I mean such as *Bucer in Script. Anglic.* prest so vehemently on King *Edw.* and the Bishops) and that they cannot contentedly hold their Lordships, Wealth and Honours, without silencing and ruining Two thousand such as I, or better; and using many thousands of godly Christians as they do; and finding that I and such others are accused as being disobedient to them---- and for not swearing and covenanting never to endeavour any alteration of their present Church-Government, and all excommunicate by the Canon that say there is any thing in it (even from the Archdeacon downward to [*the rest in Office*] *repugnant to the Word of God*) I took it at last to be my duty to give the Reasons of my dissent in a full Treatise of Episcopacy.

And because I perceived young men and strangers to former times, deceived by the general noise, *How Antient and Univer-*

Universal Episcopacy hath been; as if all that is called *Episcopacy* were but one and the same thing; or as if we were against the Primitive Episcopacy; therefore I suddenly (and too hastily for want of time,) bestowed a few weeks in summing up the Heads of the History of Bishops and Councils, out of a few Historians which were most common, next at hand, and of most credit with those whose faults I opened: That it might be truly known *How much the tumified degenerate sort of Prelacy had caused the Divisions and Calamities of the Church.*

§ 21. For this Mr. *Morrice* (as fame saith) and many more are so greatly offended with me, and say of me herein what they do. And on pretence of *Vindicating* the *Primitive Church* which untruly implyeth that I who vindicated it against corrupters did oppose it) he defendeth the corruptions and sinful miscarriages and diseases of the Prelates: And this he doth, 1. By striving to make me contemptible as *unlearned*, as if that would excuse the sins which I rehearse and lament: He findeth in one place through my haste and heedlesness, a word of *Theodoret* misplaced, and the word [*Calami*] translated *Quills*, which he thinks should be *Reeds*; and one or two more such; as if he prevaricated, and had a design to extol the Book, which he finds no more and greater fault in, than he really hath done. And he proveth it likely that I never saw the Histories that stood by me near twenty years, because the Printer put a Comma between [*Marquardus*] and [*Freherus*] (I think there are a dozen Comma's misplaced in my whole Book;) when he himself saith of his own Book [*The faults that have escaped are almost infinite.*] But of these things more anon.

2. He loudly and frequently chargeth me with malicious falsifying History; and when he cometh to the proof, I have shewed you who the falsifier is.

3. The great thing I am accused of, is making the Bishops more the causes of Heresie, Schism and Violence, than they were: And of that I have said nothing, but what I think I have fully proved: And let the Reader judge by this following Catalogue.

Domineering Pride hath been the chief cause of Heresies and Schisms, especially working in the Clergy to tumid Prelacy and Tyranny.

I. I before noted how the Apostles began to strive who should be greatest, till the effusion of the Spirit after Christs rebukes had

had cured them. And what tiranny *Diotrephes* uſed through love of Preheminence.

II. If the doubtful ſtories of *Simon Magus* be true, his tumor was more than Papal; And *Epiphanius* makes *Menander*, *Saturnilus*, *Baſilides*, to be but his Off-ſpring. The Original of the *Nicolaitans* and *Gnoſticks* (who *Epiphanius* ſaith, had enſnared himſelfonce) is utterly uncertain; *Carpocras*, *Cerinthus*, *Ebion*, *Valentinus*, *Secundus*, *Ptolomæus*, were all but Birds of the ſame *Gnoſticks* Neſt, a crazed ſort of men that mingled Chriſtianity, Platoniſm, and Magical Imaginations; and what they were themſelves, is not known: Such was *Marcus*, *Colarbaſus*, *Heracleon*, the *Ophitæ*, the *Cainites*, the *Sethians*, *Cerdo*; *Marcion* was a Biſhop's Son caſt out for vice; and *Lucian*, *Apelles* and *Severus* his Off-ſpring, the Heads of their little Sects; whether Biſhops or not, is unknown. What kind of Hereticks *Tertullian*, *Tatianus*, and *Origen* were, and how many faults as foul *Lactantius*, and many not numbered with Hereticks have, is well known: And among all theſe in thoſe early daies, till there were Popes and Dioceſans (ſuch as now) in the world, none ſuch could be Hereticks.

III. Many Councils contended about the time of *Eaſter*, and *Victor* with one part of Biſhops, excommunicated *Polycrates* and the *Arian* Biſhops; while, as *Socrates* and *Sozomen* tell us, the Churches that left it indifferent had peace.

IV. A Council of the beſt Biſhops at *Carthage* decreed Rebaptizing.

V. A Council of the Biſhops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Galatia*, &c, at *Iconium*, for Rebaptizing thoſe Baptized by Hereticks: And *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* excommunicated them all.

VI. A Council at *Synadis*, and divers others decreed the ſame Rebaptizing.

VII. Divers more *African* Councils of good Biſhops with *Cyprian*, decree the ſame, whom *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* condemneth.

VIII. Divers Biſhops are ſaid to be *Sabellian* Hereticks.

IX. *Paulus Samoſatenus* Biſhop of *Antioch* was a Heretick.

X. The Council of Biſhops at *Cirta* in *Numidia* under *Secundus* Mr. *M.* calls worſe than I do.

XI. A *Carthage* Council of 70 Biſhops *An.* 306. ſet up the *Donatiſts* Schiſm, ſtriving for the preheminence, who ſhould be Biſhop of *Carthage*.

XII. *An.* 308. Another *Donatists* Council had 270 Bishops. Many more Councils they had.

XIII. The first General Council at *Nice* we honour, and assent to its Creed: But thank *Constantine* for burning all their Libels, and keeping peace by his presence and speech.

XIV. The Schism made by *Meletius* and *Peter*, Bishops, is well known.

XV. The Heresie of *Arius* (a Presbyter that would have been a Prelate) quickly infected *Eusebius Nicomed.* if not *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, and divers other Bishops.

XVI. *Epiphanius* saith, that *Audius* was driven to his Heresie by being long abused, beaten, and at last excommunicated for reproving the Bishops and Priests for their Covetousness, Luxury, and other sins: And so he became a Bishop himself.

XVII. *Eusebius Nicom.* made Bishop of *Constantinople* (whom you tell us *Valesius* thinks was no Heretick) hired a Whore at *Antioch*, to father her Child on *Eustathius* the Bishop there, and got more Bishops to depose him, and the Emperour to banish him.

XVIII. A Council of Bishops at *Tyre* unjustly condemn and persecute *Athanasius*.

XIX. Three Bishops (saith Mr. *M.* overcome with too much Wine and persuasion) ordained *Novatian* falsly Bishop of *Rome* (before this aforementioned.)

XX. A Council at *Jerusalem*. *An.* 335. tryed and approved *Arius* Faith, and restored him.

XXI. A Council at *Constantinople* condemned *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and *Athanasius*, and justified *Arius*.

XXII. A Council of near 100 Bishops at *Antioch*, 36 being *Arians*, deposed *Athanasius*.

XXIII. Another Council at *Antioch* make a new Creed without [ὁμοούσιον.]

XXIV. A Council of 376 Bishops at *Sardica*, decree Appeals to *Rome*, which *Augustin* and the *African* Bishops were against.

XXV. The *Semi-Arian* Bishops went to *Philippopolis*, and condemned such as the other at *Sardica* had absolved, but cast out [ὁμοούσιον] as not scriptural, and cast dreadful accusations on *Athanasius*, *Paulus C. P.* and *Marcellus*.

XXVI. *An.* 350. A Council at *Milan* received *Ursacius* and *Valens*, *Arians*.

XXVII. *Stephen*

XXVII. *Stephen* an *Arian* Biſhop hired a Whore to go in to Biſhop *Euphratas*; and this *Euphratas* after turned *Photinian.*

XXVIII. *An.* 353. A Council at *Arles* condemn *Athanaſius.*

XXIX. *An.* 355. A General Council at *Milan* of above 300 Weſtern Biſhops (though the Eaſtern that were moſt *Arian* could not come) where *Athanaſius* was condemned, and communion with the *Arians* ſubſcribed.

XXX. *An.* 356. A Council at *Byterris* condemned and baniſhed *Hilary*, and condemned them as Separatiſts or Schiſmaticks that renounced the *Arian* Communion.

XXXI. A General Council at *Sirmium* of 300 Weſtern Biſhops beſides the Eaſtern, made three different Creeds, condemned *Athanaſius*, left out the word [Subſtance] made *P. Liberius*, and old *Oſius* ſubſcribe againſt *Athanaſius.*

XXXII. The Oriental Biſhops at *Ancyra* were only for [ὁμοίους] and not [ὁμοούσιον] and with *Macedonius* againſt the Godhead of the Holy Ghoſt.

XXXIII. A General Council 400 Biſhops met at *Ariminum*; of whom moſt at firſt were Orthodox; but after when the Emperour interpoſed, ſubſcribed to the *Arian* Party.

XXXIV. The reſt ſate at *Seleucia*, and were more Orthodox, but divided into *Acacians*, who were for leaving out [*Subſtance*] and *Semi-Arians*, who were for [*Like Subſtance.*] *Sulp. Severus* tells us, that many Biſhops quieted their Conſciences by [*ſubſcribing in their own ſenſe*] and ſo deceived the *Arians* that thought they had won them.

XXXV. A Council at *C. P.* made a Ninth Creed, leaving out [*Subſtance* and *Hypoſtaſis*, The *Semi-Arians* for this baniſhed the Authors.

XXXVI. A Council at *Antioch* caſt out *Miletius*, and made a Tenth Creed, worſe than the reſt.

XXXVII. *Julian* Reigning, *Athanaſius* calls a Council at *Alexandria*, which had almoſt divided Eaſt and Weſt about the names [*Hypoſtaſis* and *Perſona*;] but that ſome wiſe men perſuaded them that the words were both of the ſame ſignification; which yet was hardly entertained afterward.

XXXVIII. A Council at *Antioch* of *Semi-Arians* Petitioned *Jovianus* to caſt out the *Acacians*; till they knew his mind, and then the *Arian* Biſhops turned Orthodox.

XXXIX. At a Synod in *Tyana Euſtath. Sebaſt.* denied [ὁμοούσιον] and the Godhead of the Holy Ghoſt.

XL. An *Arian* Council of Bishops in *Caria* under *Valens*: And another at *Singedani* in *Misia*.

XLI. *Damasus* in a *Roman* Council condemneth *Sisinnius* for Conventicles: For at the Election in the Church they fought for these two: And *Damasus* his Party one day left 137 dead bodies behind them, and got the better.

XLII. *Valens* by cruelty set up *Arian* Bishops in a great part of the East.

XLIII. The first General Council at *C. P.* is commonly called the Second General, when yet that at *Sardica*, *Ariminum*, *Sirmium*, *Milan*, were General also: They were many good men, and did good: But how they used *Nazianzen* to the great grief of the Church of *C. P.* and how *Nazianzen* describeth them, I desire the Reader to take from his own words, and not from mine, or Mr. *M.*

XLIV. The Council at *Cæsar Augusta* did that which made *Martin* separate from them and all their Councils after to his death.

XLV. A Council at *C. P.* set up *Flavian* at *Antioch*, and a Council at *Rome* were for *Paulinus*: The former advance *C. P.* and *Jerusalem*.

XLVI. Many Schismatical Councils of *Donatist* Bishops followed.

XLVII. For *Theophilus* case I refer you to *Socrates* and *Sozemene*.

XLVIII. *Epiphanius* his Schismatical usage of *Chrysostom* is unexcusable.

XLIX. And so is *Theophilus* prosecution of him, and a Synod of Bishops casting him out, and *Cyril's* resisting the restoring of his name when dead, and reviling the *Joannites* that kept separated Meetings for his sake.

L. The *Diospolitan* Council absolved *Pelagius*. Divers *Carthage Councils* condemned him. P. *Innocent* condemned him. *Zosimus* once absolved him, and condemned his accusers.

The Bishops cast out for Simony, I will not number here.

LI. The Contentions between *Boniface* and *Eulalius*, and others after them to get the Bishoprick of *Rome*, are so many as I will not number them. And the striving of three Bishops successively against the *African* Fathers for the *Roman* super-eminence and Appeals to *Rome*, are commonly known.

LII. One

LII. One of Bishop *Boniface*'s Decrees is, That [*No Bishop shall be brought before any Judge, Civil or Military, either for any Civil or Criminal Cause.*]

LIII. What the first General Council at *Ephesus* did in the Cause of *Nestorius* I have fully opened: *Derodons* Evidence is undeniable, that *Nestorius* was Orthodox as to the Matter, though he mistook as to words, in thinking that Mary should not be called *The Mother of God*, but of *Christ who is God.* (which *Luther* also shews.) Yet since that Councils anathematizing him, a great body of Christians in many Eastern Kingdoms, to this day are a party hereticated by the rest. Is not such an effect of 1200 years continuance, a witness of the failing of that Council?

LIV. The Bishops of *C. P.* and *Alexandria* striving which should be greatest, a Council at *C. P.* decided it for *C. P.* where *Theodoret* was for *Alexandria*, and fell under *displeasure.*

LV. *Leo M.* Bishop of *Rome*, claims the title of *Head of the Catholick Church.*

LVI. Two Councils at *C. P.* one against *Eutyches* and the other for him.

LVII. The second Council at *Ephesus* is so heavily accused by Mr. *M.* and such others, that I need not accuse it more. *Flavianus* of *C. P.* was there hurt to death. Yet *Bellarmin* confesseth it wanted nothing of a true General Council but the Pope's approbation.

LVIII. A Council at *Alexandria* under *Dioscorus* excommunicateth *Leo.*

LIX. What the Council of *Calcedon* hath done I have shewed: Instead of reconciling the *Nestorian* and *Eutychian* Controversies by a skillful explication of their ambiguous unfit words, they *Anathematized* both and banished *Dioscorus*, And ever since to this day, the *Eutychians* and *Nestorians* are separated Dissenters.

LX. At *Alexand.* the Bishops party that the Council was for (*Proterius*) and *Timothy* whom *Dioscorus* party were for, so raged, that they murdered *Proterius*, and dragg'd his carkass in the streets, and bit his flesh: And each party still accused the other.

LXI. *Pulcheria* (*Theodosius*'s Sister and *Martian*'s Wife) being for the Council, and *Eudocia*, *Theodosius*'s Widdow for *Dioscorus*, they animated the several Parties of Bishops and Monks: And in *Palestine* *Juvenal* Bishop of *Jerusalem* was expelled, *Severianus* Bishop of *Schythopolis* killed, &c.

LXII. *Leo*

LXII. *Leo* the Emperour commanding obedience to the *Calcedon* Council, at *Alexandria* and *Antioch* the Armies of contending Bishops were in continual war, calling each other *Nestorians* and *Eutychians*; one Bishop banished by the Emperour, the contrary Bishop murdered by the people, and cast into the River; the next getting the better again, *&c.*

LXIII. In *Martian's* and *Leo's* daies most Bishops subscribed to the Council. When *Basiliscus* usurped, and was against the Council, saith *Niceph.* three Patriarchs, and five hundred Bishops renounced it, most before having damned its adversaries. *Basiliscus* recanteth his Commands, and commandeth all to be for the Council, and the Bishops obey him, save those of *Asia. Zeno* recovereth the Empire, and is for the Council, and the *Asian* Bishops turn for it, and say they subscribed to *Basiliscus* at first for fear. *Zeno* seeing it impossible otherwise to make Peace, leaveth all indifferent whether they will subscribe the Council or not. Then the War grew hotter between the Bishops and their Armies against each other, specially the Patriarchs; all being in Confusion, at *Alexand. Antioch* and *C. P.* and no Emperour wise enough to quiet them.

LXIV. *Anastasius* a peaceable man, made Emperour, leaveth all to think of the Council as they will: Then the Bishops fall into three Parties; some for every word in the Council; some anathematizing it, and some for the indifferency: The East one way, the West another, and *Lybia* another; yea each Country divided among themselves: Saith *Niceph. So great confusion and blindness of mind befell the whole World.* The Emperour falls upon the impeaceable of both sides: At his own place *C. P.* the Sedition of the People overcame him, for their Council Bishop, which turned the Emperour more against the Council, and that Bishop and the rest.

LXV. At *Antioch* the Armies of two Bishops fought it out, and the Council Party getting the better, killed so many Monks, as to save the labour of burying them, they cast their bodies into the River: And after another Party of them made as great a slaughter. For this blood the Emperour banish'd *Flavianus* the Council Bishop: This was called Persecution. *Pet. Alex.* being dead, the Bishops of *Alex. Egypt* and *Lybia*, fell all into pieces among themselves, and had separate Meetings: The rest of the East separated from the West, because the West refused Communion with them,

them unleſs they would anathematize *Neſtorius*, *Eutyches*, *Dioſcorus*, *Moggus*, and *Acacius*: And yet ſaith *Niceph. Qui germani Dioſcori & Eutychetis ſectatores fuere, ad maximam paucitatem redacti ſunt.* Note that *Flavian* the Council Biſhop for fear with his Fellow-Biſhops (threatned by Biſhop *Xenaias*) ſubſcribed an Anathema againſt *Theodore*, *Theodorite*, *Ibas*, as *Neſtorians:* The *Iſaurian* Biſhops yield to anathematize the Council. *Severus* a fierce Enemy of the *Neſtorians* made Patriarch at *Antioch*, forced many Biſhops to renounce the Council; and many to fly. The *Iſaurian* Biſhops repent and condemn *Severus*: The Emperour commanded out two Biſhops for condemning their Patriarch: The People defend them, and force the Emperour to deſiſt, becauſe he would ſhed no blood for Biſhops. *Helias* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, ſaw all the Biſhops in ſuch confuſion, that he would communicate with none of them, but the Biſhop of *C. P.* The Monks at *Jeruſalem* proclaim *Anathema* to all that *equal not the four Councils to the four Evangeliſts, and write to the Emperour that they would make good the conflict to blood,* and went about to engage men to the Council: The Emperour commanded the Biſhop to reform this: He refuſeth. The Emperour ſendeth Souldiers to compel them, and the Biſhops and Monks forcibly caſt them out of the Church. He ſent *Olympius* with a ſtronger band, who caſt out the Biſhop: The next Biſhops and more Souldiers had yet more conflicts after this, and the Souldiers driven away by force.

LXVI. *Felix* of *Rome*, with 77 Biſhops, excommunicate *Acacius* of *C. P.* (with a [*Nunquam Anathematis vinculis exuendus*) and their own two Biſhops that obeyed the Emperour in communicating. The Schiſm between *Laurentius* and *Symmachus*, came to blood-ſhed, when five or ſix Councils laboured to heal it. *Symmachus* excommunicateth the Emperour and Biſhop of *C. P.* as communicating with Hereticks; but not an *Arian* King then at *Rome*.

LXVII. A Council of 80 Biſhops at *Sidon* anathematize the Council of *Calcedon*.

The ſtriving Parties keep up ſtill in great Bodies, and the *Melchites* (as they call thoſe that obeyed Kings and the Council) have one Patriarch at *Damaſcus*, the *Eutychian Jacobites* one at *Meſopotamia*, the *Maronites* one at *M. Libanus*, all called Patriarchs of *Antioch*, (and the *Romans* make a fourth of the ſame title),

title) and the *Nestorians* have their Patriarch at *Muzal*.

Of the many Heresies or Sects that rose up from the intemperate opposition to *Nestorius*, and the woful ruines they made in the East after the *Calcedon* Councils, and all caused by Pride and Prosperity, and wantonness of Wit, and stopt only by the Conquest of the *Sarazens* and *Arabians*, and how orthodox now in their Captivity and Poverty they all are, even the *Jacobites*, the *Nestorians*, the *Armenians*, the *Cophti*, the *Abassines*, the *Indians*, and the *Maronites*, see the notable words of *Brierwrod* Enquir. p. 180, 181, 182, 183. As also how the *Persian* King was a great cause of the spreading of the *Nestorians* through his Dominions.

LXVIII. The East and West were divided in *Justin*'s Reign, on the Question, whether the names of two Orthodox dead Bishops should be restored into the *Dypticks*, even *Euphemius* and *Macedonius*, whom the Pope had damned as communicating with Hereticks; the Bishops of the East being for it, and the West against it.

LXIX. *Justin* turning the stream for the *Calced.* Council, the Bishops in a Council at *Jerusalem*, and another at *Tyre* are for it, and condemn *Severus*. And a *Roman* Council condemneth the three dead Bishops of *C. P. Acacius*, *Euphemius* and *Macedonius*.

LXX. So far were the Bishops yet from Peace, that *Justinian* being Emperour, headed the Council Party, and his Wife the adverse Party:

About 30000 they say were then killed in *C. P.* at an Insurrection.

LXXI. A mischievous Schism for the Bishoprick at *Rome*, between *Boniface* 2. and *Dioscorus* and *Agapetus* after *Boniface*.

LXXII. In *Justinian*'s time a Controversie arose, whether we may say [*One of the Trinity was crucified?*] *Hormisda* Bishop of *Rome* said *No*. The *Nestorians* took hold of this and said, [*Then we may not say* Mary *was Mother to one of the Trinity.*] *Justinian* sent for a Council about it to Pope *John*: He and his Bishops concluded contrary to *Hormisda*, that we may say [*One of the Trinity was crucified.*] And say *Baronius* and *Binius* [*Ita mutatis hostibus arma mutari necesse fuit.*] Faith changeth as occasions change. Reader, if thou seest not here how Bishops have broken the Church in pieces, I must not tell thee, lest Mr. *M.* be angry.

I in-

I intreat the Reader to see what I said, Hist. p. 132. of the Conference of *Hypatius* and the *Eutychians*.

LXXIII. A Council at *C. P.* calls their Bishop *Patriarcha Oecumenicus*, and condemn divers Bishops, as doth a Council at *Jerusalem*.

LXXIV. At *Rome* the *Arian* King made *Silverius* Bishop; and others chose *Vigilius* that murdered him. *Vigilius* excommunicated *Menna* of *C. P.* which *Justinian* revenged.

LXXV. A new Controversie is stated whether Christs body was corruptible: The denyers had *Gainas* A. Bishop; The affirmers had *Theodosius*; The first were called *Phantasiastæ*, the other *Corrupticolæ*. Most were for *Gainas*, but the Soldiers for *Theodosius*: They fought many daies, and the Soldiers killed many, and many of them were killed, and the Women with stones from the top of the houses, and the Soldiers with fire, continued the war: And the division continued in *Liberatus*'s daies: *Justinian* was so zealous for the Council of *Calcedon*, that he murdered thousands (as they say) in *Egypt*, and yet dyed a reputed Heretick himself, being for the *Corrupticolæ*, and *Evagrius* saith, when he had set the whole world in tumult, he was damned himself. But God best knoweth that.

LXXVI. A Council at *Barcelona* Decree that Priests must cut their beards, but not shave them.

LXXVII. By the Cheat of an *Eutychian* Bishop *Justinian* was perswaded that the condemning of some Writings of *Theodore Mopsuest*, *Theodorite* and *Ibas*, would reconcile the Bishops: He calls a General Council at *C. P.* to that end (usually called the 5th) His Letters are read opening the doleful divisions, that the Churches had no Communion with one another, &c. The three Bishops writings are read: *Theodorite* charged by this General Council with that salt Epistle against dead *Cyril*, and a like Speech at *Antioch*, and none vindicated him: *Binius* and Mr. *Morice* and others say the Letter is forged: I know not; But the *Tria Capitula* are condemned. And now this General Council hath made a new dividing snare. Many that were for the *Calcedon* Council feared this was a condemning of what they did in receiving *Theodorite*, &c. The Adversaries were never the more satisfyed; but saith *Binius* himself [*The end was not obtained, but a most grievous mischief added to the Church--- The whole Catholick Church was torn by Schism, and worse, the Emperour stir'd up Per-*

secution,

secution, deposed or banished P. Vigilius: *But lest the East should all forsake the West, he recanted and consented to the Council.* Doth either the work, or the effect commend this General Council?

LXXVIII. A Council of *Jerusalem* save one Bishop, presently received this Decree.

LXXIX. A Western Council at *Aquileia* condemn this 5th General Council at *C. P.* and (saith *Binius*) *separated from the whole Catholick Church* (even from *Rome*) *for an hundred years till* Sergius *reconciled them.* Q. Were the Western Bishops or the Pope then the Western Church? So many separated, that *Vigilius* being dead, there could but two Bishops (and a Presbyter) be got to ordain *Pelagius* his Successor. But the Emperour and his Pope persecute the Bishops, and the Schism seemed desperate.

LXXX. Another Council at *C. P. An.* 587. decree that *John* Bishop of *C. P.* be called *The Universal Bishop*; which greatly increased the Churches divisions.

LXXXI. King *Gunthram* called a Council at *Mascon An.* 589. finding all things grow worse and worse, & all long of the Bishops only, saith *Binius.*

LXXXII. Even Great *Gregory* called a Synod against the dissenting Bishops, and they not obeying his summons, the Bishop of *Aquileia* was ruined (the Western Head) *Sabinian* that succeeded *Gregory* would have had his Books burnt. *Boniface* the third got *Phocas* the Murderer to declare *Rome* the Chief Bishops Seat (He to whom *Greg.* had sung *Lætentur cœli, & exultet terra,* &c.)

LXXXIII. Next rose up the *Monothelite* Controversie. *Cyrus* Bishop of *Alexand.* to end the Controversies aforementioned, was told that to use the word [*Dei virilis operatio & voluntas*] would unite them all, which past as *satisfaction* in a Council at *Alexand.* *P. Honorius* persuaded them to silence [*One*] and [*Two.*]

But this Counsel was rejected, and now *whether Christ had* [*One*] or *Two Wills and Operations*, became as *de fide*, the new War of the Bishops through the world. Some were for [*One*] and some for [*Two*] as if [*Will* and *Operation*, and *One* or *Two*] were words that had but one signification; When every Novice in Philosophy must grant that Christ's *Will* and *Operation* in some sense, was but *One*, and in other senses *Two*, as I have proved. But *Sergius* Bishop of *Const.* set it on foot, *Heraclius* being for it, and *Pyrrhus* his Successor followed it on. And *Sergius* by a Council

Council of Bishops at *C. P.* decreed for [*One Will.*]

The Opinion and the Emperour *Constans* his silencing both, are condemned at *Rome.* The Pope, Emperours and Bishops, are all condemned, and persecuting each other about it.

LXXXIV. *Const. Pogonat.* called a General Council at *C. P.* called the 6th, which condemned *Macarius* Bishop of *Ant.* and the pacificatory Epistles of *P. Honorius* and *Sergius* as Heretical, and all that were for *One Will*, and *One Operation* of Christ; 1. As denominated *a naturis & earum principiis seu facultatibus*, *the Divine and Humane Will and Operations* were and are *Two*: 2. As *denominated ab unitate personæ*; they are the *Will* and *Operations* of *One person*, and so far may be called *One.* 3. As *denominated ab unitate objectivâ* they are *One*: The *Divine* and *Humane Nature will* the same thing, so far as the Humane *willeth*, and do so far the same work: But if any will make a new Heresie by disputing whether the Divine Nature alone do not *will* and *act* somewhat without the *volition* and *action* of the Humane (since the Incarnation) they shall have no company of mine in it. 4. In the sense as the Operation of the principal and instrumental Cause are *One*, producing *One Effect*; so Christ's Divine and Humane Operations are *One.* 5. As *Consent* denominateth *Unity*, and the Old Christians are said to be of *One heart and soul*, *One mind and mouth*; and Christ prayeth that we may be *One* in him, so his *Will* and *Operation* are *One.* 6. Yea if there be a sort of *Union* between Christ & his Members, and between the Blessed in Heaven, which is quite beyond our present comprehension, it is much much more so between Christ's *Divine* and *Humane Will* and *Operations.*

And now Reader, whether it was well done to pass over these and many other needful distinctions, and to put men barely to say that Christ's *Will* and *Operations* were not *One*, *but Two*, when really they were both *One* and *Two*; and to make the Pope himself a Heretick, for one of the wisest Epistles that ever Pope wrote (I am no such enemy to a Pope as to be partial;) and to divide the very Western Church from *Rome*, and make *Aquileia* its Head for an hundred years, and to set all the *Roman* Empire in a flame, anathematizing and separating from one another, because they had not skill or sobriety enough to ask each other by such distinctions what they meant, I say, if this be wisely and well done, and be a praise to Prelacy, and I be to blame for

blaming it, then good and evil is but what every diſeaſed ſoul will make it. Mr. *Morrice* and his Maſters, that honour their *Leviathan* for ſuch works as theſe, do tell us, that they would do it themſelves were it to be done again. And let it be their work, and the reward be theirs: For my part I abhor and renounce it.

LXXXV. Faith and Salvation now depended ſo much on Arithmetick, that the Biſhops of *Spain* raiſed another Arithmetical Controverſie, aſſerting *Three Subſtances in Chriſt, his Divinity, his Soul, and his Body*, and ſay, [*A Will begat a Will*, that is, the *Divine*, the *Humane*.] Theſe things are true. But the wiſe Pope was ſo affrighted with *Arithmetical Controverſies* by experience of the miſchievous Effects, that he cautioned them much about it, and for that ſome judged him erroneous.

LXXXVI. The Council at *Trull* was one of the beſt that ever they had, yet ſhewed the Core of the Churches Plague, by decreeing, *That whatever alteration the Imperial Power maketh on any City, the Eccleſiaſtical Order ſhall follow it.* This Clergy ambition nurſt up Anti-Chriſt.

LXXXVII. A Council at *Aquileia* condemned the 5th General Council for condemning the *Tria capitula*.

LXXXVIII. Pope *Sergius* condemning the *Trullane* Council, the Emperour commanded him to be a Priſoner, and the *Souldiers* bribed reſcued him.

LXXXIX. *Bardanes Philippicus* being made Emperor, he calleth a General Council at *C. P.* where, ſaith *Binius*, *out of the Eaſt there were innumerable Biſhops*, (which is not ſaid of any other Council) who all condemned the 6th General Council, and their Decrees of *Two Wills and Operations*.

Here (not I, but) *Baronius* and *Binius* ſay [*Thus at the Beck of an Emperour, and the Will of a Monothelite Patriarch, the holy 6th Synod is condemned, and what they ſaid of Two Wills with Chriſt, and two Operations, and all retracted by the Decree and Subſcription of very many Oriental Biſhops, that were in one moment turned from being Catholick to be Monothelites.*] But do they forget the 100 Year, that even the Weſt made a head againſt the 5th Council and the Pope.

XC. Next all the World is ſet together by the Ears about Images, for which the Pope rebelled againſt and rejected the Emperour for *Charles Martel* of *France*.

And Pope *Zachary* bid *Boniface* call a Council to eject the Aſſertors of *Antipodes*.

XCI. In

CXI. In a General Council at *C. P.* 338 Bishops condemned the worshipping of Images, and swear men not to adore them, and destroyed reliques, *&c.* and decreed, that Christ's Body is not flesh in Heaven: But the Pope and Western Bishops of his Party, condemn this Council.

XCII. The *Greek* Bishops condemn the *Roman* Bishops for adding [*Filioq*;] to the Creed, and so another occasion of Schism is raised.

XCIII. The Schisms in *Italy* and *Rome* itself now grew so great and the Effects in Blood and Confusions so dismal, that I must not number them one by one.

XCIV. *Constantine* and *Leo Isaur.* Emperours, being dead, a Woman *Irene*, and her Infant Son are for Images, and call a General Council for them at *Nice*, where *Tharasius* Bishop of *C. P.* got the Bishops to carry it for Images and Reliques, and the Chief Bishops that had condemned them before, now cryed *peccavimus*, and condemned those that were against adoration of Images, *&c.* If Mr. *Morrice* call me an Enemy to Repentance for reciting this, I cannot help it.

XCV. Yet more Schism: Two Bishops, *Felix* and *Elipandus*, say, *That Christ as the eternal Word was Gods natural Son, but as Man he was but his adopted Son*: (thinking that *duo fundamenta*, viz. *Generatio aterna, & temporalis, duas faciunt Relationes, filiationis in una persona.*] But Councils condemned them as making two Sons. And the great Council at *Frankford* condemning the second Council of *Nice*, and Image-worship, condemn also these two Bishops, 1. For saying *Christ was God's Adopted Son*; 2. And that *by Grace*; 3. And that he was a *Servant*: Is any of this false, not excluding a higher title?

The Council concludeth that *Christ was not a Servant subjected to God by penal servitude*: Sure it was part of his suffering for our sins, to be in the form of a Servant, *Phil.* 2.7.

XCVI. *Binius* saith the *Filioq*; was added to the Creed by the *Spanish* and *French* Bishops without the Pope.

XCVII. One Council at *C. P.* restored him that married the Emperour adulterously to another wife: And another condemned *Theod. Studita* and *Plato*, for being against it.

XCVIII. The most excellent Emperour *Ludov. Pius* was so zealous to reform the Bishops, that they hated him, and in a Council at *Compendium* (*Compeigne*) most perfidiously deposed him,

him, and after basely abused him, even without the Pope.

XCIX. As to please his *Son Lotharius*, they deposed the Father; so when he was beaten by his Brethren, they after in a Council at *Aquisgrane* (*Aken*) deposed *Lotharius*, accusing him as they did his Father.

C. At *C. P.* a Council was called by the power of another Woman *Theodora* and the Bishops that had under divers Emperours condemned Image-worship, now turn to it again, and anathematize on a sudden the opposers.

CI. The Bishops own *Lotharius* Adulterous marriage with *Waldrada*.

CII. The Councils that set up and pull'd down *Ignatius* and *Photius* at *C. P.* and the woful stir that they made as Emperours changed, were lamentable.

CIII. Many contrary Councils were between the *French* Bishops that were for *Lotharius* divorce and the Pope.

CIV. *Basil* the Emperour writes to the Pope to pardon all his Bishops, or else they should be without, because all had miscarried, and turned with the times.

CV. A General Council at *Const.* called by the Papists, *The Eighth General Council*, condemned *Photius* again, and set up *Ignatius*, and the Changers cryed, *peccavimus*, and make extreme Decrees for Images (But they well condemn *subscribing to be true to their Patriarchs and Bishops*;) but decree that all Princes and Subjects worship the Bishops, who must not fall down to them. Other horrid Elevations of Prelates above Princes they decreed---saying, *A Bishop, though it be manifest that he is destitute of all Virtue of Religion, yet is a Pastor*; and the Sheep must not *resist* the *Shepherd*.

CVI. A dangerous Rent between *Rome* and *C. P.* what Bishop should have the *Bulgarians*.

CVII. A Council at *Metz* called *Prædatorium*, gave the Kingdom to *Car. Calv.* unjustly.

CVIII. A Council at *Pavia* falsly make *Charles* Emperour.

CIX. Another (*Pontigonense*) confirmed it; (the Pope claiming the Power.)

CX. A *Roman* Council unjustly made *Ludov.* 3. Emperour.

CXI. A General Council at *C. P.* again set up *Photius*, and cast out [*Filioq*;.]

CXII. The *Roman* actions for and against *P. Formosus*, are odious to all sober Christians Ears.

CXIII. A

CXIII. A Council at *Soyſons* confirm the A. Biſhoprick of *Rhemes* to a Child of five years old, Son to the E. of *Aquitane*. Divers other Councils do and undo about the ſame Cauſe.

CXIV. The Hiſtory of the Biſhops of *Rome* and their Councils from hence forward is ſo lamentable that even the moſt flattering Papiſt Hiſtorians mention them with deteſtation. So that I muſt not ſtay to name many particulars.

CXV. *An.* 1049. A *Roman* Council was fain to pardon Simoniacal Biſhops and Prieſts, becauſe the Cry was, that elſe none would be left to officiate.

CXVI. Being come into the *Roman* ſink, I will paſs above an hundred more of the Councils of this woful ſort of Biſhops, leſt Mr. *Morrice* think that I ſuppoſe him to vindicate them, or not to abhor them. Only remembering my Reader of a few General or notable things : *viz.*

I. The multitude of Schiſms, and long vacancies at *Rome* ; and the horrid incapacity of very many Popes, which prove an interrupted ſucceſſion.

II. The horrid wars that long infeſted *Italy* by the Popes means.

III. The diſmal wars with many Emperours, and the Biſhops and Councils half on one ſide and half on the other.

IV. The Council that called the Emperours and others Princes power of inveſting Biſhops, the *Henrician* Hereſie, and judg'd the Biſhops that had been for it to be dig'd out of their graves and burnt.

V. The Subjecting and debaſing of all Chriſtian Princes, making them but as the Body, and the Moon, and the Biſhops, to be as the ſoul and the ſun. Eſpecially the General *Lateran* Council which decreed Tranſubſtantiation, and all to be Hereticks that denied it ; And oblige all temporal Lords to exterminate all ſuch Hereticks on pain of Excommunication, depoſition & damnation.

VI. The Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſils* that were for Reformation how falſly and cruelly they dealt with *Hus* and *Jerome* and rejected the four great requeſts of the *Bohemians*, and fixed their pollutions.

VII. The Councils of *Florence*, and that of *Trent*, which had more Learned men, who yet more obſtinately managed the Enmity to Reformation.

VIII. The preſent State of the Univerſal Church throughout the World as it is divided into *Papiſts*, *Proteſtants*, *Greeks*, *Moſcovites*,

covites, Georgians, with the *Circaſſians* and *Mengrelians, Armenians, Neſtorians, Jacobites, Cophtis, Abaſines, Maronites, Melchites*: And what thoughts theſe have of one another.

And I would deſire Mr. *Morrice* to tell us,

1. Whether he believes not verily that all theſe Inſtances prove that the Biſhops have been the chief cauſe, and that by Ambition, Pride and Worldlineſs?

2. Whether it be not the Biſhops that in the *Roman* and other Parties now, are the greateſt hinderers of Reformation, and of Concord? and it would not be ſoon done were it not through them?

3. Where it is that he will ſtop in his Vindication of the Biſhops and their Councils, and go no further? and by what cogent reaſon?

4. Whether he thought he had well defended the Church-Tyranny which I accuſed? 1. By vindicating the firſt Ages, and others whom I praiſed, and accuſed not; 2. And by letting fall his Vindication (ſave a few conſequent quibbles) at the fourth General Council; which was in 451. And ſo ſeems to vindicate the Biſhops and Councils but for the ſpace of 150 years of the time that I mentioned their degeneration?

5. Whether if the Biſhops had been willing when they had the King's Commiſſion to make neceſſary alteration, or were but to this day willing to prefer things neceſſary before things hurtful or indifferent, we might not live in happy and holy Love and Peace in *England*?

6. Whether he can blame a man that believes in Chriſt, for lamenting the doleful corruption and diviſion of the Chriſtian world, and for enquiring of, and lamenting the ſinful cauſes.

7. If that Church Prelacy which they juſtly call the beſt in all the world can endure no more Pariſh Diſcipline than we have, nor can endure ſuch a Miniſtry as are ſilenced by hundreds or thouſands (than whom no Nation on Earth abroad that I can hear of hath better) can you blame us for ſuſpecting that ſomewhat is amiſs with them, and more with others?

8. I hope you will yet remember that I did not appear as an accuſer of Prelacy or Conformity, but as importuned by your ſelves to give the reaſons why I dare not take your *Covenant* and *Oath* never to endeavour any alteration of your Church Government: and that after ſeventeen years ſilence. My prayers

to

to God shall be my endeavour for these following Alterations.

1. That the Primitive Discipline may be exercised in the Parish Churches, as *Bucer* importuned the King and Bishops *de Regno Dei*, &c.

2. That to that end we may either have so many Bishops under the Diocesan as be capable to do it, or the Presbyters enabled, allowed and obliged to do it.

3. And that we may not instead of it have only a distant Court of men that know not the Parishioners, where a Lay Chancellour decreeth Excommunication, and Absolution, which the Parish Priest must publish, though his conscience be against it.

4. And that Dioceſans may not silence faithful Ministers without such cause as Christ will allow, nor set up ignorant bad ones and bind the Parishioners to hear and communicate with no other. I am so far from precise expectations from Dioceſans, or from reviling them, that I do constantly praise them as very good Bishops who do no harm, or but a little, and if they should never preach themselves, so they will not hinder others.

9. And as for my calling *Things* and *Persons* as they are, I hope you will not say that it was out of *Malice* that *Anastasius Platina*, *Massonius*, *Stella*, *Sigibert*, *Baronius*, *Genebrard*, *Binnius*, &c. have recorded such horrid crimes of Popes, and others also of Prelates. And is it malice in me to transcribe their History?

I am of Dr. *Henry Moore*'s mind, who saith, [*Mystery of Iniq.* p. 388. "*Hence it is plain that they are the truest friends to* "*Christendom, even to* Rome *it self, that do not sooth them up in* "*their sins, by mitigating and hiding their foul miscarriages, but* "*deal apertly and plainly with them for their own safety; that nei-* "*ther admit, nor invent subterfuges to countenance or palliate their* "*Idolatrous and superstitious practices, but tell them plainly how* "*much they are apostatized from the true Worship of God and Christ* "*into Paganism and Idolatry. Better are the rebukes of a faithful* "*friend, than the hired flatteries of a glozing mercenary.*] I pray mark this well.

10. I take two things to be the degenerating and corruption of Episcopacy.

1. When they became so *bad* that they were not *willing* to do good according to their undertaken Office. Bad men will do ill in any place.

2. When they had put themſelves into a ſtate of *incapacity*, that they *could not do the Good* undertaken, were they never ſo willing.

1. Since great Baits of Wealth and *Domination* have tempted the worſt men to be the Seekers, Biſhops have rarely been good, except under a Saint-like Prince or People that had the Choice; nor are ever like to be. And what work the Enemies of Holineſs will make by abuſing Chriſt's Name againſt himſelf, is eaſie to know; ſuch will take the beſt men for the worſt, and call them all that's naught, that they may quiet their Conſciences in deſtroying them.

2. And ſince a Dioceſs of many hundred or ſcore Pariſhes hath had but one Biſhop for Diſcipline, the work is become impoſſible to the beſt. But when a few Bad men will mercinarily undertake Impoſſibilities, and ſo *Badneſs* and *Impoſſibility* go together, alas, what hope, but of a better world above?

Saith *Luther de Concil. & Eccleſ. p.* 300. *Sed quam ſunt intenti hanc craſſam & aſininam fatuitatem? Unus Epiſcopus nonnunquam habet tres Epiſcopatus vel Dioceſes, & tamen vocatur Unius Uxoris maritus, & cum habet tantum unum Epiſcopatum, tamen interdum habet centum, ducentas, quingentas Parochias, aut etiam plures, & vocatur tamen Sponſus unius Eccleſiæ --Hi non ſunt digami--Tam inſulſas & ineptiſſimas nanias recipit mens humana; ita permittente Deo cum a verbo diſcedimus, & omnia limatius & ſubtilius ſcrutamur quam ipſe vult nos ſcrutari.*] Whether you reverence *Luther* any more than *Calvin* I know not.

11. To conclude this matter, two things I deſire you, or at leaſt the Reader to conſider,

1. Whether it be not a dreadful thing for a man to make the Church corrupting, dividing and confounding ſins, to be all his own by defending or excuſing them, on a falſe pretence of Vindicating the Primitive Church Government, which was contrary to them?

2. Whether you truſt to Truth and Evidence, or to Intereſt and depraved Judgments, if you think men ſhall believe that you have confuted all this undoubted Hiſtory, and the preſent experience of all the woful Chriſtian World, by a general Cry that I write falſly and maliciouſly, or by ſaying that I am unlearned, or that I truſted to a Tranſlation, or *Binnius*, or that *Binnius* miſtook the year, (things that I will not turn over my Books

Books to try,) or that I misplaced or misunderstood a word of *Theodorite*, or mistranslated *Calami*, or such like. Such Believers of you are guilty of their own deceit.

§ 22. There is lately published by a nameless Prelatist, to shew the World what Spirit he is of, a Book pretending by the description of my Life from 1640. till 1681. to prove me one of the worst men alive. To that I will now say but these few words.

1. That let them take me to be as bad as they will, so they would have some mercy on their own and others Souls, and the Church of God.

2. That it's no wonder that we differ about Antient Times and History, and present Impositions, when the main difference in our Times is, who are godly, yea tolerable Christians, and who are intollerable Rogues; and those that (as before God) by long and intimate acquaintance, I judge to be the most serious, conscionable, humble, holy Ministers and People that were ever known to me, are the Persons that the Prelatists prosecute, silence, and cry out against as the most intollerable wicked Enemies of Piety, Truth and Peace. What is it that is the root of this?

3. That this foresaid Book is one continued Calumny, unworthy of an Answer, partly making my duty my sin (as that I disliked the many drunken Readers that were the Teachers of my Youth, *&c.*) and partly perverting scraps of sentences; and partly reciting one revoked *Book*, and a few retracted sentences of another, when *Augustin* is commended for retracting far more, and filling it with a multitude of most gross untruths, of his own fiction.

4. That as to his and Mr. *Morrice* and others talk of the Wars I say.

1. That I never thought the Parliament blameless.

2. That yet on *Bilson*'s grounds I was in my Judgment, and Speech, and Action, comparatively for them while they made their Commissions to *Essex* for King and Parliament.

3. That from *Naseby* Fight I wholly laboured to have drawn off their Souldiers from Errour, and Rebellion, and Usurpation; in which I did and suffered more than multitudes of my Accusers.

4. That I never went so far against the Power of the King as

R. Hooker whom I have long ago confuted.

5. That I never ſtruck or hurt man in the wars.

6. That I will conſent to be ſilenced and impriſoned if they will but give thoſe Miniſters leave to preach Chriſts Goſpel that never had to do with wars (unleſs for the King.)

7. That when our beginning Concord had reſtored the King, the *Scots*, though unſucceſsfully fought for him, *Monk* & his Army, that had bloodily (at *Dundee*, &c.) fought againſt him, had with the Concurrence of Sir *Tho. Allen*, the *Londoners* and Presbyterians reſtored him, when the King by them came in Triumph, Honoured *Monk* and others of them, conſeſt them the Cauſe of his Reſtoration, paſt an Act of Oblivion that we might all live in future Peace, I ſay, If after all this it be Prelacy and Clergy Intereſt and Spirit, that will rub over all the healed wounds, and ſtrive again what ever it coſt us to ulcerate the peoples minds, and reſolve that the Land and Church ſhall have no Peace, but by the deſtruction of ſuch as reſtored the King; I ſhall think never the better of Prelacy for this. But ask them, why did you not Speak it out in 1660 to *Monk* and his Army, or till now.

§ 23. And whereas that Advocate (deſcribed *Joh.* 8.) and you are ſtill deceiving the ignorant by facing men down with Confidence that I lie in ſaying that [*Two Epiſcopal Parties began the War in* England *and the Papiſts and Preſbyterians came in but as Auxiliaries.*] I again ſay,

1. Allow me but reaſonable leave, and I will prove it to the ſhame of you if you deny it.

2. At preſent I will but recite one clauſe in *Whitlocks* Memorials, pag. 45. even after they thought themſelves under a neceſſity to pleaſe the *Scots* as far as they could. ["*Anno* 1640. "*The Commons had debate about a new Form of Eccleſiaſtical Go-*"*vernment*, and *July* 17. *agreed, That every Shire ſhall be a ſeve-*"*ral Dioceſs; a Presbytery of Twelve Divines in each Shire, and* "*a Preſident as a Biſhop over them; and he with the aſſiſtance of* "*ſome of the* Presbytery *to ordain, ſuſpend, deprive, degrade and* "*excommunicate. To have a Dioceſan Synod once a year, and* "*every third year a National Synod, and they to make Canons, but* "*none to be binding till confirmed by Parliament.*

"*The Primate of* Armagh *offered an expedient for conjunction* "*in point of Diſcipline, that Epiſcopal and Presbyterian Govern-*"*ment might not be at a far diſtance, but reducing Epiſcopacy to*

"*the*

" *the Form of Synodical Government in the Primitive Church*

Were not these men Episcopal? It's much like Mr. *Thorndike*'s own motions saving his Opinion for Forein Jurisdiction.

§ 24. As to your first and last Chapters, and about the Antient Extent of Churches, while my Treatise of Episcopacy, which fully confuteth you, is unanswered; if I repeat it again, it will not be read by weary men. And another hath answered those parts of your Book, which is ready for the Press.

I after tell you where *Chrysostom* even in his time numbers the Christians in that great Imperial City to be an hundred thousand, that is as many as in *Martins* and *Stepney* Parishes, and perhaps in *Giles Cripplegate* too.

§ 25. To conclude, whereas Mr. *M.* in general chargeth me as falsifying History, I still call my self a HATER of FALSE HISTORY, and loath Mr. *Morrice*'s History, because it is false: But if he will instead of falsifying and trifling, shew me any false History that I have owned, I will thank him unfeignedly, and retract it. But factious reproaching of good men, and painting the deformed face of Vice, go not with me for convincing proof. If I am not near of kin to *Erasmus*, I am a stranger to my self, even as *Merula*, and M. *Adamus* describe him, [*Ingenio erat simplex; adeo abhorrens a mendacio, ut puellus etiam odisset pueros mentientes; & senex ad illorum adspectum etiam corpore commoveretur. Dignitatum & magnarum divitiarum contumax contemptor; neque quicquam prius etio habuit ac libertate.*] And I think, as it is said of *Cuspinian*, [*Ratus se satisfacturum ingenuo Lectori, siquæ veriſſima esse comperisset simpliciſſima oratione mandaret posteritati: satis enim est historico* (*ut præclare dixit apud Ciceronem Catullus*) *non esse Mendacem.*]

And as to my ends and expectations, I am not so vain as to write with any great hope of persuading many, if any who are possest of large Dioceſs, Wealth and Power, to forsake them, much less to cure the common Thirst that corrupted Nature is possest with, and to be the means of a Publick Reformation: If I may satisfie my Conscience, and save some from being deceived by false History about the Causes of the Antient Schisms, it's all that I can hope for: Had I lived in *Alb. Crantzius* daies, I might perhaps have said as he of *Luther* [*Frater, Frater, abi in cellam tuam, & dic Miserere mei Deus:*] *Et de Canonicis κατ' ἀντίφρασιν dictis, Nunquam posse eos reduci ad meliorem frugem*

nisi

niſi prius a viris doctis expugnata arce (i. e. Papatu.)

And for my ſelf, none of the Intereſted mens reproaches are unexpected to me: Anger will ſpeak. I know what the Papiſts ſay of the Reformers, and all the Proteſtants: And yet I expect that all at laſt will turn to the diſgrace of falſhood, by putting men to ſearch Church-Hiſtory for the Truth.

The caſe of *Capnio* is worth a brief recital. A covetous Jew pretending Converſion, contrived with the Fryers and Inquiſitors, to get a great deal of money from the Jews, by procuring an Edict from the Emperour to burn all the Jews Books, that ſo they might purchaſe them of the Fryers. The Emperour will firſt hear what *Capnio* a great Hebrician ſaith: *Capnio* adviſeth to ſpare all that only promoted the Hebrew Literature, and burn only thoſe that were written againſt Chriſt. *Hoſtrate* and the Fryers were vext thus to loſe the prey, and accuſed *Capnio* of Hereſie: The cauſe is oft tryed, eſpecially at *Rome*: All the Learned Hebricians were for *Capnio*: The Fryers raged the more: This awakened many Learned men to ſearch into the Cauſe, and armed them againſt the Fryers. *Galatinus*, *Hutten*, *Eraſmus*, &c. are for *Capnio*. The Fryers accuſe them alſo of Hereſie: But by this they ſtirred up ſuch a Party of the moſt Learned men againſt them, that when *Tezelius* came to vend his Indulgencies, *Luther* had ſo many ready to joyn againſt the Inquiſitors and Mercenary cheating Fryers, as greatly furthered the Reformation. And two or three ingenuous Conformiſts who have lately written againſt the violent battering Canoneers, do tell us that ſome are like to be excited by the Overdoing of the Accuſing ſilencing Party, to ſearch better into the matter of Fact and Right, till they can diſtinguiſh between an Eucraſie and a Tympanite.

Or if this world be incurable, they cannot keep us out of the heavenly *Jeruſalem*, where there is no Errour, Schiſm, nor Perſecution, becauſe no Ignorance, Malignity or Pride, but the General Aſſembly of perfect Spirits, are united in one perfect Head, in perfect Life, and Light, and Love.

The

The particular Defence of the Hiſtory of Councils and Schiſms.

An Account to Mr. Morrice *why my mentioning the Church-diſtracting ſins of the Clergy, when worldly grandeur corrupted them, is not a Diſhonouring, but a Honouring of the Primitive Church. And to vindicate thoſe ſins is no Vindication of the Primitive Church.*

CHAP. I.

The Reaſon and Deſign of my Hiſtory of Biſhops and Councils.

§ 1. THEY that know the men with whom I have to do, and the Cauſe which I have in Controverſie with them, will eaſily underſtand my purpoſe. The Perſons with whom I am to deal, are ſuch as hold,

1. That a *General Council* of Biſhops or the Colledge of Biſhops Governing *per Literas formatas* out of Council, are the Supreme Governing Power over the Univerſal Church on Earth, having the Power of Univerſal Legiſlation and Judgment.

2. That among theſe the Pope is juſtly the Patriarch of the Weſt, and the *Principium unitatis* to the whole, and the ordinary Preſident in ſuch Councils. And ſay ſome, It belongs only to the Preſident to call them, and they are but rebellious Routs that aſſemble without a juſt call.

3. That there is no concord to be had but in the Obedience to this Univerſal Governing Church. But all Perſons and all National Churches are Schiſmaticks who live not in ſuch Subjection and obedience.

4. That ſuch as the Dioceſan Epiſcopacy which is over one loweſt Church containing hundreds or multitudes of Pariſhes and Altars without any other Biſhop but the ſaid Dioceſan is that Epiſcopacy which all muſt be ſubject to, while it is ſubject to the Univerſal ſupreme.

5. That every Chriſtian muſt hold ſubjective Communion with the Biſhop of the place where he liveth: And ſay ſome, muſt

must not practise contrary to his Commands, nor appeal for such practice to Scripture or to God.

6. That if this supreme Power silence the Dioceſans, or these Dioceſans silence all the Ministers in City or Country, they must Cease their Ministry and forsake the Flocks.

7. And say divers of them, They are no true Churches, or Ministers, that have not ordination from such Dioceſans, yea by an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles: And for want of this the Forein reformed Churches are no true Churches, but the Church of *Rome* is.

Much more of this Nature I have already transcribed (and confuted) out of A. Bishop *Bromhall*, Dr. *Heylins* Life of A. Bishop *Laud*, Mr *Thorndike*, Mr *Dodwell* and divers others.

§ 2. The first thing then in my intention is to shew that the *Roman* Grandeur which is thought to be the Glory of the Church on Earth, and the necessary means of its Unity, safety and true prosperity, hath proved clean contrary, even the means of Church corruption in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline & Conversation, the Soil of the most odious crimes, the means of tyranny, suppression of true piety, and persecution of Gods faithful Servants, and of rebellious, War and cruel bloodshed.

§ 3. To this end I described the steps by which the Clergy ascended to the Papal height: For as all Protestants justly maintain that their Corruption of Doctrine & Worship came not in at once but by slow degrees, so do they also of the Papal Government and discipline. And they commonly shew the vanity of the Papists demand, who ask us who was the man, and which was the year, as if the world had gone to bed in simple Christianity, and awaked Papists thenext morning. Whereas it is most evident in all Church history that the Clergy leaving the Christian Purity, Simplicity and Love, did climb the ladder step by step till they ascended to the Papal height. And it's a meer dream of them that think it was the Bp. of *Rome* alone that thus ascended, and not the Army that made him their General: As the boat riseth with the waters, so did the Pope with the ascending Clergy: Others strove for superiority as he strove for Supremacy: The strife began among Christs Apostles who should be greatest, and who should, sit next him in his Kingdom; And though Christ then suppresst it by his Word and Spirit, and the sufferings of the Church took down those aspiring thoughts, as soon as *Constantine* had set them the Ladder

Ladder, what scrambling was there who should climb highest. Yea *Constantinople* strove for the Supremacy it self.

§ 3. And I the rather mentioned this because I found some late learned Expositors of the Revelations, taking this inordinate ascent, for the promised glory and felicity of the Church on Earth; and taking it for the fulfilling of many of those prophecies and promises which some applyed to the Millennium, and some to the heavenly state. And doubtless *Hildebrand* and his adherents had such thoughts, and did believe that their rule over Emperours, Kings and Kingdoms, by the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, was the true Glory of the Church, and the Reign of Christ, and that all the honour was indeed given to Christ as King of the Church, which was thus given to the Pope and the Church-Parliaments of Bishops. *Campanella de Regno Dei* doth but speak the thoughts of greater Clergy men when he applyeth the foresaid Texts to prove that the Popes Universal Monarchy is the true Kingdom of Christ on Earth, to which all Monarchs and Men must stoop.

And Nature is so apt to entertain such thoughts, especially in the Clergy, who think of it as their own prosperity and glory, that it is no wonder, if as *Venner*, and his Fifth Monarchy-men, did itch to be getting up under the name of the Reign of Christ, and so did *John* of *Leyden* and his Company at *Munster*; so the Fifth Monarchy Clergy men, who can aspire more plausibly, do long to be climbing, and are very reconcilable to Papal Greatness; and where Popery is become a distasted name, they nevertheless desire their share in the Power, Honour and Wealth, and under pretence of Peace and Concord among all Christians, and restoring the Church to its Unity and Strength, they strive for much of the same thing, and think it enough to avoid the name: And the Pope shall be but *Principium Unitatis*, and the President of the Clergy or Councils. Get but the poor trick of calling nothing Popery but the Pope's Arbitrary absolute Power, and do but tie him to Rule by the Consent and Laws of Church-Parliaments, that is, set up the *French* Church-Government, and then they are no Papists. Do not the *French* Protestants deserve all their sufferings then for calling the Church or Bishops there *Papists*, and separating from so Excellent a Government?

§ 5. And it was not the least of my Motives to try, were it possible to cure their Love-killing Errour, who think that all

are Enemies to Unity and Peace, who are not for Obedience to this Universal or Superlative Prelacy, and to save us all from that confusion and calamity, which this Opinion is carrying on, while the Patrons of it think that all are to be prosecuted, silenced, ruined as Rebellious Enemies to the Ruling Church, who do not subject themselves to such a Prelacy; and that we must or can have no Christian Church-Concord, but by Obedience to the Universal Church, as Bishop *Gunning* hath over and over told me, that is, to the Universal Colledge of their sort of Bishops: Yea not only the Papists, but these Bishops among us, to this purpose repeat and apply *Psal.*72.11. Yea all Kings shall fall down before him: All Nations shall serve him. Or *Isa.* 60.12. *For the Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: Yea those Nations shall be utterly wasted,*] which Bishop *Gunning* applyeth to the Episcopal Universal-Governing Colledge.

These are terrible threatnings, as they shew the principles and purposes of men, however they mistake the mind of God. Few parts of *Europe* have had more long and cruel Wars, than *Italy* it self, where these Principles have obtained: But the blood of thousands of sincere Christians hath been a Sacrifice to these Principles in the Clergy. When we read in Jesuites, Fryers and Prelates, sound Christians called Hereticks, and all such Hereticks called, mortal, odious, wicked, pernicious, intollerable Enemies to the Church, whom all good men are bound to endeavour to root out and destroy; when we hear our neighbour Papists say, *It is no more sin to kill an Heretick than a Dog*: And when we hear and read our Clergy calling out to Magistrates for yet more *Execution upon us*, for not obeying them against that which we undoubtedly take for the Law of God; and the nearer any man is to the Papists, usually the more he is for our destruction, and for their way of cruelty, I thought it time to try if it were possible, if not to save the Land from this consuming fire, yet at least to save some Souls who else were like to be tempted to malignant Enmity to the best and truest Christians, and to perish for ever by this deceit.

How many honest passages are in Mr. *Thorndike* which shew that it was not any worldly interest of his own that moved him; but yet the Power of this Errour [*Of a Church that was Universally One by One Ruling Colledge or Council of Prelates, of which*

which the Pope was the rightful President,&c.] which must be acknowledged by all Nations and Persons, that will have Christian Communion and not be condemned Schismaticks, prevailed with him to the exclusion of all Dissenters, and confining his Communion to those only who owned and obeyed *This Universal Governing Church*.

§ 6. And as long as this Opinion prevaileth, especially in men of Power and Reverence who take other mens belief and obedience for their unquestionable right, where can we think hatred and Persecution will stop. Will not they still think that they that kill or silence or imprison or banish us, do God service, and that the Magistrate that doth not punish us deserveth punishment from God, if not also from the Church. And they that are most for Seldom preaching, and can dispense with our Ministerial labour therein, will not be indifferent as to the silencing, imprisoning or destroying us.

§ 7. Whether we have any reason to refuse swearing or subscribing to them, and never to endeavour any alteration of their Government as it is in *England*, I have sincerely endeavoured to shew in my Treatise of Episcopacy. And if Christian Concord and Communion be so hard and narrow a thing, as that no men are Capable of it who are not of a higher form than I, as to understanding, impartiality and willingness to know the Truth, the Church and Christianity are things beyond my capacity and reach: But I doubt not but it is humane errour that would dwindle it into so small a Sect.

§ 8. Alas what Persons for Knowledge and Life can they bear with in their Communion, who cannot bear with such as they silence and ruine in this Land! And the Papists can receive even those that know not Christ if they do but profess obedience to the Clergy-Church. *Luthers* words are harsh, but I will recite them *de Concilus Part* 3. *Pag* 291. *Si monstraverint mihi unum aliquem ex tota illa multitudine qui possit æquare unum alphabetarium in aliqua erudita Schola, aut in summa doctrinæ Christianæ, vel in Scriptura Sacra tantum profecerint, quantum una aliqua puella septem annorum; tunc illis concedam palam--- nisi quod plus callent traditionum humanarum, & Sycophantiarum: Quod valde credo, & firmius quam in Deum credo, cum me convincant facto ipso ut credam.* To this pass did the Clergies aspiring then bring the Church, when worthy men were silenced and persecuted.

secuted. And we are unwilling of any thing that looketh towards a differencing men so contrary to that which Christ will make at last.

CHAP. II.

Whether we have any reason to report the Faults of some Bishops and Councils, from the beginning of their Depravation till the last?

§ 1. THat I had great reason for it, I think what is before said will evince; when we see men destroying Christian Love, themselves, and us, and the Land, could they prevail, by their erroneous endeavour to grant no Concord, Communion nor Peace, to no Christians how conscionable otherwise soever, who cannot unite in a species of Prelacy which they believe (by such evidence as I have given) to be contrary to the Law of Christ. To the saving men from Heresie and Schism now, our opposers (and we) do judge it useful, to know how Hereticks and Dividers miscarried heretofore, that others may beware. And is it not as true if Bishops be the Dividers? And also when the Clergies Ambition and Usurpation have brought that upon the Christian World which it languisheth and groaneth under in East and West, is it not needful to open the beginning and progress of the disease, by such as had rather it were cured, than the Church destroyed by it?

§ 2. Among the multitude of Protestant Church-Historians and Chronologers, how few are there that do not do the same, though in various degrees? He that will read the *Magdeburgenses*, or *Lucas Osiander*, *Illyrici Test. Verit.* *Melanct hon* himself, and *Carion Funceius*, yea peaceable holy *Bucholtzer*, *Micrelius*, *Neander*, *Phil. Pareus*, *Hen. Gutberleth*, &c. yea or *Julius* or *Jos. Scaliger*, *Salmasius*, *Hottoman*, *Hottinger*, *Morney*, shall see the faults of Bishops opened before this day.

§ 3. The pious and moderate Papists themselves report and lament them: Such as *Clemangis*, *Pelagius Alvarus*, *Mirandula*, *Ferus*, *Jos. Acosta*, *Lud. Vives*, *Gerson*, *Erasmus*, and many other such.

§ 4. The antient Godly Bishops are they who for the most part

part have been freeſt in reprehending the vices of the reſt; eſpecially *Greg. Nazianzen*, and *Chryſoſtom*, and many antient godly Presbyters have been as free, as *Gildas*, *Iſidore Peluſiota*, *Salvian*, *Sulp. Severus*, *Bernard*.

§ 5. And if I have wronged the Biſhops or Popes in this Abridgment, their own Hiſtorians, yea their chief flatterers have wronged them. One Pope angered *Platina* by impriſoning him: Yet if he be partial, it is for the Clergy, and not againſt them. But who will believe that *Binnius*, *Baronius*, *Crab*, *Genebrard*, *Bellarmine*, *Petavius*, and ſuch others have ſpoken too hardly of them. There is no one man that I took ſo much from as *Binnius*: And what ſhould move him to name ſo many of the miſcarriages of the Councils, but the neceſſity of reciting the Acts of the Councils hiſtorically as he found them?

§ 6. The Sacred Scriptures record the Crimes of the beſt men in all the Ages of which they write, even *Adams*, *Noes*, *Lots*, *Aarons*, *Davids*, *Solomons*, *Hezekiahs*, *Joſiahs*, *Peters*, all the Apoſtles, *&c.* And it was not done out of ſpite or malice; but as a neceſſary warning to us all.

§ 7. The falſhood of Hiſtory is an intollerable abuſe of mankind: To know nothing done before our times, is to ſhut up mankind in a dungeon; and falſe Hiſtory is worſe than none. And it may be falſe and deceitful in *defect* as well as *exceſs*. He that ſhould record all that was good in the Popes, and omit all the reſt, would be a dangerous deceiver of the world, and do more than hath been done to make all Chriſtians Papiſts. You tell us your ſelves, that he that ſhould write the Hiſtory of *Cromwell*, *e. g.* or of any Sect that you are againſt, and ſhould leave out all their faults, would be taken for a falſe Hiſtorian.

§ 8. They that write the Hiſtory of mens Lives, do uſe to record their Parentage, Birth and Education: And ſo muſt he that will truly write the Hiſtory of Church-Tyranny, Perſecution and Schiſm. The end is not well underſtood without the beginning. Who is it that heareth how many Ages the Chriſtian world hath been divided into *Papiſts*, *Greeks*, *Jacobites*, *Neſtorians*, *Melchites*, &c. and that ſeeth what work the Papacy hath made, but will ask how all this came to paſs? Did the man that died of Gluttony, ſwallow all at one morſel? or rather one bit after another? And when the Clergy have ventured on one merry Cup, or one pleaſant morſel in exceſs, it's

eaſie

easie to make them believe that one, and one, and one Cup more; one, and one, and one bit more, is no more unlawful than the first. *Principiis obsta*, is the Rule of Safety.

If Papists intending the recovery of *England* to the Pope should say [" *Let us but first get them under the Oaths, Covenants* " *and Practices which we will call Conformity, and so cast out most* " *that dare not sin, and by this engage them as two Armies in con-* " *trary Interest to fight against each other, and it will be an easie* " *matter to bring the swallowing Party to go further by degrees, and* " *to believe that as a Parish Church must not be independent as to* " *the Diocesan, nor the Diocesan to the Metropolitical or National,* " *so neither must a National be independent as to the Universal:* " *And that the Universal therefore must have its known stated Go-* " *vernment as well as the National,*] Were it not necessary here for him that would save the Land from Popery to shew the danger of the first degrees.

The usual Method is not to use *Boccalines Roman* Engine, which will help a man to swallow a Pompion that he may get down a Pill, but to swallow a lesser Pill first and a bigger next, till the Pompion will go down. Infancy is before manhood.

§ 9. But the great necessity was as aforesaid, from the revived or rather Continued attempts, of imitating the fatal *ambitious* and *Contentious* malady. If Priscillians, or Gnosticks should rise now among us, were it not our duty to set before them the history of the miscarriage of their predecessours. And when men are so much set on restoring an Universal Supremacy, is it not meet to shew them where, and when, and with what success the aspiring humour did begin. If we have small visible probability of escaping, we must yet before we come to *Smithfield*, satisfy our Consciences that we betrayed not the Church.

CHAP. III.

Of Mr. M's *notice that I am Unlearned.*

§ 1. MR. *M*'s Preface Contracteth the Chief things which he hath to say against me in his book, that the Reader may find them there all together. And of these [*that I am unlearned*] is not the least. And if that be any of his question I assure him it shall be none of mine. I am not yet so vain as to

to plead for my Learning: Yea, I will gratify him (though he accuse me of being against repentance) with an unfeigned confession that my ignorance is far greater than his accusation of *unlearnedness* doth import. Alas I want the knowledge of far more excellent things than languages. I do but imperfectly know my self, my own soul, my own thoughts and understanding: I scarce well know what knowing is. Verily if no knowledge be properly true that is not adequate to the object I *know nothing*: And subscribe to *Zanchez, quod nihil Scitur*, (by such as I.) Alas Sir I groan in darkness from day to day, & I know not how to be delivered! How little do I know of that God whom the whole Creation preacheth, and of that Society which I hope to be joyned with for ever, and that world which must be my hope and portion, or I am undone. Many whom I am Constrained to dissent from upbraid me with my ignorance, and I suppose it is that for which they silence me, reproach, hate and prosecute me; even because I have not knowledge enough to discern that all their impositions are lawful (or else I know not what it is for) But none of them all can (and will) tell me, how I should be delivered from this ignorance: If they say, [*It must be by hard study*] I can study no harder than I have done. If they say [*I must be willing to know the truth*] I take my self for sure that I am so: If in that also I am ignorant, in thinking that I know my own mind when I do not, what else then can I hope to know? If they say [*You must be impartial*] I think I am so, saving that I must not deny or cast away the truths already received. If they say [*You should read the same books which have convinced us*] I read far more of the Papists and *Prelatists and other sects* that write against me, than of those that are for me. And the more I read the more I am confirmed. And when these men preach and write against the *Calvinists*, they render them odious as holding that *men are necessitated to sin* and *to be damned*, and that it is long of *Gods Decree which cannot be resisted:* Therefore I suppose they will not lay the Cause on God. I do then confess my Ignorance, of matters a thousandfold greater and more needful than those which they mention in their accusations. I confess my self unlearned: But I intreat them that tell me of my disease (which I know to my daily grief much better than they) to tell me also how I may be cured. If they say that it must be by *Fines and Imprisonment* it hath been tryed & I am yet uncured: I hope they will

will not pronounce me remedileſs and not tell me why, who uſe themſelves to ſpeak againſt thoſe that preach men into deſperation; would they but tell me the ſecret how ſo many thouſands of them came to be ſo much wiſer than I, in far ſhorter time, and with far leſs ſtudy, it would be (if true) an acceptable deed of Charity; rather than to tell me of the Ignorance which I cannot help. Could I but know needful truth in Engliſh, I would joyfully allow them to glory of being more skilful in all the Oriental Tongues, and alſo in *French, Iriſh, Spaniſh and Italian*, than I am.

CHAP. IV.

Of his Accuſation, that I vainly name Hiſtorians which I never ſaw or read.

§ 1. I Muſt profeſs that it never was my purpoſe to tell the world how many Hiſtorians I have read; nor to abridge all that I have read: And thoſe that I have moſt read I have there made no mention of, as not being for my intended end: And multitudes that ſtood by me, I never opened to the writing of this hiſtory, my deſign being chiefly againſt the Papiſts and thoſe Proteſtants who moſt eſteem their writings, and had rather unite with the French Papiſt Church, than with us Nonconformiſts: Therefore when I was paſt the firſt 400 or 500 years, it was the greateſt and moſt flattering Popiſh hiſtorians that I abriged, as *ad hominem* being likeſt not to be denyed.

I told the reader that I made not uſe of *Luther* the *Magdeburgenſes*, nor the Collections of *Goldaſtus, Marquardus Freherus, Reuberus, Piſtorius*, &c.] And the Printer having put a Comma between *Marquardus* and *Freherus*, he Conjectures that I took him for two men, becauſe I added not the *Chriſtian names of the reſt*: And he concludes that [*whoever this miſtake belongs to, it's plain that Mr. B. had but little acquaintance with thoſe Collections.*] For I *name ſome of the Authors therein.*

Anſ. Seeing theſe things are thought juſt matter for our accuſers turn, I will crave the Readers patience with ſuch little things while I tell him the truth. It is about 25 years ſince I read the *German* Hiſtory in the Collections of *Freherus, Reuberus* and *Piſtorius*, and about 30 years ſince I read the Collections

of

of *Goldaſtus*: The *Magdeburgenſes*, *Oſiander*, *Sleidan*, or any ſuch Proteſtants I thought vain to alledge to Papiſts. About ſeven or eight years ago as I remember, I was accuſed for Preaching, and Fined by Sir *Thomas Davis*; and the Warrant was ſent by him to Sir *Edm. Bury Godfrey* to levy it on me by Diſtreſs: I had no way to avoid it but *bona fide*, to make away all that I had: Among the reſt I made away my Library, only borrowing part of it for my uſe. I purpoſed to have given it almoſt all to *Cambridge* in *New-England*: But Mr. *Knowles* (yet living) who knew their Library, told me that Sir *Kenelme Digby* had already given them the Fathers, Councils and Schoolmen, but it was Hiſtory and Commentators which they wanted. Whereupon I ſent them ſome of my Commentators, and ſome Hiſtorians among which were *Freherus*, *Reuberus* and *Piſtorius* Collections, and *Nauclerus*, *Sabellicus*, *Thuanus*, *Joſ. Scaliger de Emendat. Temp.* &c; But *Goldaſtus* I kept by me (as borrowed) and many more which I could not ſpare; and the Fathers and Councils and Schoolmen I was ſtopt from ſending. Now whether I was unacquainted with thoſe that partly ſtand yet at my Elbow, and which I had read ſo long ago, muſt depend on the Credit of my *Memory*; and I confeſs my Memory is of late grown weak, but not ſo weak as to think that *Marquardus Freherus* was not one man, and a Palatinate Councillor, though it be names that I moſt forget; why I gave not the Chriſten names of *Reuberus* and *Piſtorius*, whether becauſe I forgat them, or becauſe I minded not ſo ſmall a thing, not dreaming what would be inferred from it, I remember not. But when I wrote that abridgment, I made uſe of none that I thought the Papiſts would except againſt: For the firſt ages I gathered what I remembred out of the Fathers, and out of *Euſebius*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Evagrius*, *Theodoret*, the *Tripartite*, *Nicephorus*, *Liberatus*, *Brev. Victor Vtic.* *Beda*, and ſuch others as are by them received: Beſides which I principally followed and Epitomized *Binnius*, and *Crab*, and partly *Baronius*, with *Platina*, *Onuphrius Panvinius*, *Stella*, *Petavius*, and others of their own. And I reſolved I would not ſo much as open *Goldaſtus*, or any Proteſtant Collector, that they might not except againſt their Credit, and reject them as *malicious curſed Heretiks*, as *Labbe* doth *Melchior Goldaſtus* and almoſt all ſuch others as he mentions; and as *Gretſer*, *Sanders*, and other Papiſts commonly do. Therefore even thoſe Hiſtories which

be in *Goldastus*, I would not take as out of him, but some of them from the books published by others, and some as cited by *Binnius*, *Petavius*, or other such. And this is now the proof of my Vanity.

§ 2. It is a mistake if he think that I intended (as he speaks) to be a *Compiler of General Church History*; When I professed but to acquaint the English Reader with the true matter of fact out of the Papists themselves, what the ambitious part of Bishops and Councils have done, and by what degrees the Papacy sprung up, and whether subjection to the ascendent exort Prelacy be absolutely necessary to Concord and Salvation.

§ 3. As to his saying [*I am the first that ever reckoned* Nazianzen *among Historians*,] I take the writings of the Fathers, especially *Justin*, *Clemens Alex.* *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Eusebius*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Hierom*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustin*, to be the best part of Church History, especially their Epistles. And of this opinion I am not the first.

CHAP. V.

Of his Accusation of my citing Hanmer *and other Translators, and being deceived by* Binnius *and such others.*

§ 1. 1. HE accuseth me for not using *Valesius* his Edition of *Eusebius* and those Editions of the Councils which he accounteth the best: To which I say,

1. I am not Rich Enough to buy them, nor can keep them if I had them. Must none write but Rich men? The French Councils would cost more than many of us are worth: We have had no Ecclesiastical maintenance these 19 years; and we cannot keep the books we have. *Luther* wrote his book *de Conciliis* when it seems he had never read many of the Councils Acts, but as related by *Eusebius Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and the *Tripartite* History.

2. Dr. *James* hath long ago warned all Scholars to make much of *Crab* and other old ones, (and the Fathers as Printed at *Basil* by *Erasmus*, *Amerbachius*, &c.) and not to trust much to new Editions, as coming through untrusty hands.

3. Is

3. Is *Valesius* a man of so much credit with you? Do you believe what he saith of *Grotius* as being in judgment for the Papal Church, and only in prudence delaying his visible Communion with them, that he might draw in many with him? (*Vales.* in *Orat. de Petavio*:) If he lye in this, and the succese of *Petavius* on *Grotius*, why should he be more trusted than others? If not, I need not tell you what to think of those Bishops and Drs. who profess to be of the same mind and Church as *Grotius*; nor again to tell you who they be.

4. My design led me not to make use of Criticks, but only to tell the world, what the Papists themselves confess, such as I have throughout cited.

§ 2. As for my using *Hanmers* Translation of *Eusebius* and *Socrates*, my case was as before described: *Valesius* I had not: *Grineus* I made use of heretofore. But since I was by constraint deprived both of my books and money to buy more, when I wrote that Abridgment, I had only *Hanmers* Translation left me. And if that sort of men that forced me to give away my books, to keep them from being distreined on, will make use of this to prove me ignorant of them, the matter is very small to me.

If you say, I should not then have written, I answer, could they so have silenced us in the Pulpit, they had more answered their own judgment than mine. I had no use for Criticks, nor for any thing in *Eusebius* and *Socrates* that depends on the credit of the Translator.

§ 3. As to his oft noting that in Translations, and sometime in Chronology I err by following *Binnius*, I answer, had I written a full Church History, I should better have examined him and others. But I lay no stress of my cause of any of *Binnius* his Translations, nor will I undertake for any Historian that I cite: My business was but to tell those that believe *Binnius* and *Baronius*, and such other, what they say. Nor do I yet intend to bestow any time, in examining whether he wrong *Binnius* or not, it being nothing to my cause nor me, whether he mistook a year, or the meaning of a word of the Authors whom he citeth.

§ 4. He saith I use an old uncorrect Edition of *Binnius* 1606. *Ans.* It is that which is in most common use, entituled, *Recognita, Aucta, notis Illustrata*, dedicated to the Pope, and to *C. Baronius, ejus monitu scripta, qui veterem illam, mendosam, mutilam & confusam compilationem mille locis illustravit*, &c. commonly

Preferred before *Crab*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, &c. But any quarrel serveth some men.

CHAP. VI.

Of his Accusations of my own Mistranslations and Mistakes.

§ 1. OF these there are two real Oversights which he nameth, committed by too much hast and heedlesness: The one is, that I misplaced [*Vere*] in the Translation of a Speech of *Theodorets*; a gross oversight I confess: The other, that I put [*Episcopi*] as if it had been the Genitive case, when it was the Nominative plural; which also was a heedless oversight. And about the death of *Stephanus*, he noteth my mistranslating *Calami*; and I imagine yet he is scarce certain what it signified himself. As for his note of my use of [*Scripture*] about the *Ephesine* Council, I purposely kept to the literal Translation, that none might say I did mistranslate it; but I never said that by the *Scriptures* was meant the Bible.

§ 2. This Accuser puts too great an honour on such a History as mine, which goeth through so many Ages and Acts, in noting so few, and such little things. I never pretended to be as good an Historian as he is; yet I do not think that it was any thing but a slip of memory that made him put *Eustathius* instead of *Flavian*, as kickt to death at *Ephesus*. And methinks he that thus begins his *Errata* of his own Book [*The faults that have escaped are almost infinite:*] should not for one false Comma of the Printers, have passed the foresaid censure of me.

But doth not this Learned Historian know, how ordinarily the greatest of them do charge one another with manifold Errours, and of far greater moment than these forementioned. How few Historians do not this? Yea, what bitter censures doth he pass himself on no lower Historians than *Socrates* and *Sozomen?* It would be tedious to give you the Instances that every such Book affordeth. I see he valueth *Labbe* the Jesuite. How oft doth he accuse Historians of Errour, Ignorance, Malice, &c. *e. g. de Anastasio Biblioth.* so eminent a Writer of the Popes Lives, yet [*Errat Vossius & siqui alii cum Anastasio Presbytero*, &c.] And

even

even of that famous History of the Popes, [*Onuphrius Panuinius, Gerh. Vossius, & plerique alii ultimam censent esse ab Anastasio scriptam, Nicolai 1. Papæ Vitam, & a Gulielmo S.R.E. Bibliothecario additas fuisse Hadr. 2. & Steph. 6. P. Vitas : Verum Cardinalis Baronius iis refragatur eidemque auctori omnes illas ascribit ; sunt quoque qui a Damaso Papa, &c.*] Here the greatest Historians differ about one of the most noted Histories.

Of *Augustin*'s Works (*To. 1. p. 129.*) he tells you that *Bellarmine* tells us not what Edition he used : But it's certain he used not the *Antwerp*, or *Plantinian* Edition, which was the best, and the Original of all the rest.]

P. 132. Rivet and *Perkins* are derided for disowning some Epistles.

P. 135. Erasmi, Riveti similiumque ridetur a doctis censura (viz. de lib. Continent.) And I profess my self less skilful in such matters than *Erasmus*.

Et ibid. Erasmus & Hosius Juliano opus illud tribuere videntur, Pamelius tanquam incerti Authoris allegat : Nos cum Lovaniensibus Bellarmino, aliisque Catholicis Augustini esse censemus, nec tricæ Riveti deterrent.

P. 136. Quæst. Vet. & Novi Test. non sunt Augustini ut facile omnes consentiunt : Quamvis sub ejus nomine citatæ reperiantur ab Episcopis Lutetiæ Paris. An. 824. Congregatis & quibusdam aliis.

Of *Ausonius* the Poet, *p. 171.* he saith, [*Quam falsa sint quæ de eo scripsit Jo. Trithemius quivis vel ex ipsa lectione intelliget.*

Of *Mantuan*, *p. 173.* [*Ex Trithemii encomio hæc dubio procul omni obliteranda : [Qui metro Virgilium, Ciceronem prosa æquat, ne dicam superat :] Sunt enim falsissima iis qui gustum aliquem latinitatis habent.*

Of *Beda*, *p. 184.* See what he saith of *Will. Malmsbury*, *Mat. Westminst. Vossius* and *Baronius*.

Of *Boethius*, *p. 204. Honorius Augustod.---ubi falso narrat Mediolani interfectum fuisse---*

P. 217. Plura adversus Leunclavium, primum eorum editorem declamavit Jac. Billius (de Cæsario.)

De Claudio Scoto, p. 228. Tho. Dempsterus multa pro more suo indigesta effudit---

De Gerson, p. 565. Errat post Possevinum Maraccius qui Joan. hunc Monachum ordinis cœlesti---asserit---Idem quoque ex Patrologo eradendum.

See

See what he saith *de Julio Africano*, that the *Annotationes eruditiss. in Euseb. Eccles. Hist.---Opinioni nostræ in plerisque adversantur.*] I suppose he means that *Valesius* which I wanted.

And *de Justino Mart. Scaligerum errasse, &c.*] *Et p.* 833. (*insigne mendum ex Trithemio, Gesnero, Simlero, Sexto, Possevino,* Bellarmino, Miræo, *aliisque propagatum*---)

To. 2. *p.* 361. *Smaragdos duos in unum confuderunt, Trithemius, Sixtus Senensis, Possevinus, Bellarminus, Miræus aliique passim*---] Abundance such charges tell us how much greater Errours are charged on the greatest Historians, than Mr. *Morrice* chargeth on me, with the least shew of probability.

How many score of Historians doth *Blondell* cite, who he thinks have falsly told us of a Pope *Joan*?

What abundance of faults would *Casaubon* have found in *Baronius*, if he had lived to go through him as he began? And I profess my self much more ignorant in History than *Baronius*.

It would be tedious to number all the gross Errours that *Vossius* citeth *de scriptor. Græcis & Latinis*; *e.g.* in the *Later. p.* 230. *Hos duos confudit Trithemius---vid. quæ habet de Flac. Alcuino, p.* 290, 291, 292. *De Usuardo, p.* 295. *cont. Gualterium & Baronium, Wicelium, p.* 296. *& cap.* 32. *de Turpino contra Trithemium & alios. Et cap.* 33. *de Walafr. Strab. Trithemius vehementer errat---Et Laur. Surium Bellarmin. in Catal. & alios nonnullos in errorem induxit.*

Vid. & quæ de Aimoino, p. 308, 309. *habet, & contra Possevinum, p.* 310. *& contra alios,* 311. *Et contra Baronium, Breulium. &c.* 312. *Et de Haimone cap.* 35. *contra Trithemium, & de Rabano Mauro, p.* 315. *Et de Landulph. Sagace contra Cæs. Orlandium. De Anastas. c.* 35. *p.* 319. *De Hincmaro contra Trithemium, c.* 36. *p.* 320. But I must not tire the Reader: Multitudes of such Instances this one Author gives us: And how few Historians charge not others with Errours so much greater, and more than Mr. *M.* with any Truth accuseth me of.

§ 3. As to his notes on my Titles of some Councils, it's past my memory, whether it was my carelesness, or (as I think) the Printer's Errour, to put [a Council at *Aransican, Toletan, Regiense*, for *Concilium Aransicanum, Toletanum, Rhegiense.*] If it was my act, I forgot that I had first put the Substantive in English. But he may oft find the same names used to his mind: And sure it is no falsification of the History.

§ 4. But

§ 4. But he hath a far greater charge againſt me, that *I did not apprehend the mind of the Council at* Tours; why ſo? The words are [*Nos vero ſiquos Lex perimi jubet, ſi cupiunt audire præconem, volumus ut convertantur ad vitam: Nam perimendi ſunt oris gladio & communione privandi ſi relicta ſibi ſeniorum decreta obſervare noluerint, &c.* Here he ſaith the meaning is, [The Eccleſiaſtical Laws do puniſh ſuch with perpetual Excommunications, yet this Council thought fit to mitigate it, *&c.*] The Queſtion is, Whether [*Quos Lex perimi jubet*, ſignifie Death, or Excommunication?] I take it to be Death, and that the Council ſaith [Though by the Law ſuch are to Die, if they will hear the Preacher, we will have them converted to Life: But ſo that if they will not be ſeparated, the Church Sword of Excommunication ſhall cut them off inſtead of Death.] My Reaſons why [*Lex perimi jubet*] ſignifieth Death, are from the expreſs foregoing words, [*Quia etiam Lex Romana conſtituit, ut quicunque ſacratam Deo Virginem vel Viduam fortaſſe rapuerit, ſi poſtea eis de conjunctione convenerit, capitis ſententia feriantur. Item ſiquis, non dicam rapere, ſed attentare matrimonii conjungendi cauſa, ſacram Virginem auſus fuerit, capitis ſententia feriatur. Cum etiam in Chronicis habeatur de Virginibus Gentilium tempore, quæ ſe deæ Veſtæ ſacraverant, poſtmiſſo propoſito & corrupta virginali gratia, Legali ſententia vivas in terra fuiſſe defoſſas.* If none of this ſignifie Death, I confeſs I underſtand not Latine. I thought the Council meant Death by [*Lex perimi jubet,*] but they would be more merciful; which I blamed them not for, but noted here what many other Canons inſtance, where they alſo puniſh murder but with keeping men from Communion, that this agreeth with ſome Sectaries Opinion. I leave Mr. *M's.* great skill in expounding Councils here to any equal Judge. But if I ignorantly miſtake in all this, and neither [*Capitis ſententia feriantur*] nor [*Vivas in terra defoſſas*] ſignifie Death, but Excommunication, yet many other Canons after cited fully tell us of the Biſhops Clemency.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Mr M's. *Exposition of Church History tryed by his Exposition of my own words: And* 1. *Of his false supposition that I am only for a Church of one Congregation meeting in one place.*

§ 1. IF so many repetitions of my Opinion cannot save Mr *M.* from so untrue a supposition of my self, I must not too far trust him, of the sence of those that he is as distant from as I. Yet this supposition running through all his book, shews that he wrote it against he knew not whom nor what. His foundation is because I define a single Church by *Personal present Communion.*

§ 2. I do so: And 1. Doth he think there is no such thing as Christians conjoyned for assembling in Gods ordinary worship, under the Conduct of their Proper Pastors. I will not censure him so hardly as to think he will deny it. 2. Are these Churches or not. I suppose he will say, Yea. 3. But is there no *Personal Present Communion* but in publick worship. Yes sure Neighbours who worship God in divers places, may yet live in the Knowledge and conversation of each other; and may meet for Election of Officers, and other Church businesse, and may frequently exhort, reprove and admonish each other, and relieve each other in daily wants; and many meet sometimes by turns in the same place, where they all cannot meet at once: We have great Towns, (like *Ipswich, Plymouth Shrewsbury*, &c.) which have many Parishes, and yet Neighbourhood maketh them capable of [*Personal Communion in Presence*] as distinct from [*Communion* by *Letters* or *Delegats with those* that *we neither see nor know.*] And we have many great Parishes which have several Chappels, where the People ordinarily meet yet *per vices* some one time and some another come to the Parish Churches. Have these no Parochial *Personal Communion*?

To the *well-being* of a *Church*, I confess I would not have a single Church of the lowest species have too many, nor too few: No more than whose Personal Communion should be frequent in Gods publick worship. Nor so few as should not fully employ more Ministers of Christ than one. But to the *Being* of a Church,

I only

I only require that the End of their Association be *Personal Communion* as distinct from distant Communion by Letters and delegates. And by [*Communion*] I mean not only the Sacrament.

§ 2. It is in vain therefore to answer a book that goeth on such false suppositions, and a man that will face down the world that I plead for that which I never owned, and so frequently disclaim.

CHAP. VIII.

Of his false supposition that I am against Diocesan Bishops, because I am against that species of them which puts down all the Bishops of single Churches, and those Churches themselves.

§ 1. THis supposition goeth through almost all the book: In his preface he saith [*The superiority of Bishops over Presbyters* is *acknowledged* by *Catholicks*, and *Schismaticks & Hereticks, &c. and yet this Church history would have us believe the Contrary.*] And so throughout.

§ 2. And yet to shew that he knew the Contrary in one place he confesseth it, and described part of my judgment, and saith that none will be of my mind in it, but it is singular to my self: Yea I had in my Disput. of Church Government, which he taketh on him in part to answer, and in my Treat. of Episcopacy which he also pretends to answer in part, told them of more sorts of Bishops than one that I oppose not, no not A. Bishops themselves: And one of them hereupon notes it as if I differed but about the name, submitting to Dioceſans so they may but be called A. Bishops. To whom I answered that A. Bishops have Bishops under them, so that though I over and over even to tediousness tell them it is the *deposing of all the first* or lowest *Species of Bishops* and *Churches*, and *Consequently* all *Possibility of true Discipline that I oppose*, and submit to any that oversee many such Churches without destroying them and their priviledges instituted by Christ] I speak still in vain to them: These true Historians face down the world that I write whole books to the clean contrary.

CHAP. IX.

Of his ſuppoſition that I am an Independent, and yet that I plead for the cauſe of the Preſbyterians.

§ 1. THis is alſo a ſuppoſition that is part of the *Stamina* of his Book; and how far he is to be believed herein judge by the evidence following.

1. He knew what I ſaid before for three ſorts of Biſhops, 1. *Epiſcopi Gregis*, Overſeers of ſingle loweſt Churches, as of Divine Inſtitution: 2. For *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum*, or Preſidents. Biſhops *ejuſdem Ordinis, non ejuſdem Gradus*, in the ſame Churches, as of early Humane Inſtitution, which I reſiſt not. 3. *Epiſcopi Epiſcoporum*, Overſeers of many Churches, which I ſuſpect to be Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, and of ſuch as *Timothy*, *Titus*, *&c.* in the continued ordinary part of their work, (exerciſing no other Power than they did:) Inſomuch that Dr. *Sherlock* would be thought ſo much leſs Epiſcopal than I, as that he ſaith, *It is Antichriſtian* to aſſert *Epiſcopos Epiſcoporum*.

§ 2. And Dr. *Parker* hath newly written a Book for Epiſcopacy, which I hear many deſpiſe; but for my part I take to be the ſtrongeſt that I have ſeen written for it theſe twenty years; but to no purpoſe againſt me; for it is but for Epiſcopacy in general, which I oppoſe not. It excellent well improveth the Arguments of the K. and Biſhops at the Iſle of *Wight*; even that one Argument that a Superiority of ſome over others being ſettled by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that Form muſt be ſuppoſed to continue, unleſs we have clear proof of the Repeal or Ceſſation. I have oft ſaid the ſame; I could never anſwer that Argument: But this will not juſtifie the depoſing of thouſands of Biſhops and Churches, and of their Diſcipline, to turn them all into two or three Dioceſans.

§ 3. Alſo he knoweth that I have written theſe 35 years againſt Lay-Elders; believing that the Colledge of Elders which of old aſſiſted the Biſhops, were none of them Lay-men, nor unordained, but of the ſame Order, though not Degree, with the Biſhop himſelf.

§ 4.

§ 4. And I have alſo written that Synods of Biſhops or Preſbyters are but for Concord, and have not as ſuch by a major Vote a proper Government of the minor part or abſent: Much leſs that Claſſes, and other Aſſemblies, are the ſtated Church-Government which all muſt obey: And are the Presbyterians of any of the three forementioned Opinions?

§ 5. I ever held a neceſſity of manifold dependance of all Chriſtians and Churches. As all depend on Chriſt as their Head, ſo do all the People on the Paſtors, as their authorized Guides, whom they muſt not Rule, but be Ruled by, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12, 13. *Heb.* 13. 17, 24. And all theſe Churches depend on each other for Communion and Mutual Help, as many Corporations in one Kingdom. And frequent Synods well uſed, are greatly helpful to theſe ends: And the Command of doing as much as we can in Love and Concord, doth bind all the particular perſons to concur with the Synods in all things that tend to the Peace and Edification of the Church, or are not againſt it. And more than ſo, if the general Viſitors or Biſhops that take care of many Churches, do by God's Word direct, inſtruct, reprove, admoniſh the particular Biſhops and Churches, they ought with reverence to hear them and obey them. And if Independents really are for all this, why do theſe Accuſers repreſent them odiouſly, as if it were no ſuch matter, but they were meerly for Church-Democracy? Either you are not to believed in what you ſay of them, or of me.

§ 6. I know we have men that ſay, that on pretence of acknowledging all this Epiſcopacy, I put down all, becauſe I take from them the power of the Sword, and leave all to deſpiſe them if they pleaſe. *Anſ.* This indeed is the power that under the name of Epiſcopacy now too many mean. Biſhop *Bilſon* knew no Power but Magiſtrates by the Sword, and Miniſters by the Word. But why name I one man? It is the common Opinion of Proteſtants, and moſt ſober Papiſts, that Biſhops as ſuch have no power of force on Body or Purſe. But we deny not the forcing Power of the Magiſtrate. 3. But we heartily wiſh that they would keep it in their own hands, and never uſe it to force unwilling men into the Church, or to Church-Communion; high Priviledges which no unwilling perſon hath any right to. This is my Independency.

CHAP. X.

Of his Accuſation, That I make the Biſhops the Authors of all Hereſies and Schiſms, as diſtinct from Presbyters, Monks and People.

§ 1. THis alſo runs throughout his Book; and muſt ſuch Books be anſwered or believed? I never denyed the guilt and concurrenee of others with them. I only ſay, That as Biſhops were the Chief, ſo they had the chief hand, as far as I can yet learn, in Hereſies and Schiſms, ſince they came to their height of Power, and ſpecially in thoſe grand Hereſies and Schiſms, which have broken, and keep the Churches in thoſe great Sects and Parties, which in Eaſt and Weſt it conſiſteth of to this day. I never doubted or denyed but that 1. The Hereſies that were raiſed before the Church had any Patriarchs, or the turgent ſort of Biſhops, were certainly raiſed without them. 2. And afterward ſometime a Presbyter began a Hereſie. 3. And the Biſhops were but as the Generals of the Army in all the Church Civil Wars. But I never denyed but the Prelatical Prieſts, Monks, and multitude were their obſequious Army.

§ 2. Mr. *M.* ſaith, That thoſe Biſhops that were Hereticks, were moſtly ſuch, or inclined to it before. *Anſw.* 1. Was there then a good Succeſſion of Ordination, when the World groaned to find it ſelf *Arian*? Were all theſe *Arians* before their Conſecration?

Anſw. 2. Were they not all Prelatical Presbyters that aſpired to be Biſhops, and ſo as they ſay had a Pope or Biſhop in their bellies. I never thought that Prelatical Prieſts that ſtudied Preferment, and longed to be Biſhops, had no hand in Hereſies nor Schiſms, no more than that the *Roman* Clergy are innocent herein, and the fault is in the Pope alone. What a deal then of this man's Book is loſt and worſe, on ſuch ſuppoſitions?

CHAP. XI.

Of his confident Accusation, that I mention all the faults of the Bishops, and none of their Goodness, or Good Deeds.

§ 1. THis also is a chief part of the *Warp* or *Stamen* of his Book. In his Preface he saith, ["*This History of* "*Bishops is nothing else but an Account of all the faults that Bishops* "*have committed in the several Ages of the Church, without Any* "*Mention of their Good Actions, of their Piety and Severity of* "*their Lives; of their Zeal for the Faith, &c.*]

Answ. 1. Whether this Fundamental Accusation be true or false, let the Reader who loveth Truth see 1. In the very first Chapt. from § 41. to the end. 2. Through all the Book where I oft praise good Bishops, good Councels, and good Canons, and good Books and Deeds. 3. In the two last Chapters of the Book, written purposely to hinder an ill use of the Bishops faults.

In the first Chapter ["*Very many of the Bishops themselves were* "*humble, holy, faithful men, that grieved for the miscarriages of* "*the rest*: Though such excellent persons as *Gregory* of *Neocæsarea*, *Greg. Nazianz. Greg. Nyssen*, *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Hillary*, *Prosper*, *Fulgentius*, &c. were not very common, "no doubt but there were many that wrote not Books, nor "came so much into the notice of the World, but avoided con- "tentions and factious stirs, that quietly and honestly conduct- "ed the Flocks in the wales of Piety, Love, and Justice. And "some of them (as Sr. *Martin*) separated from the Councils and "Communion of the prevailing turbulent sort of the Prelates, "to signifie the *disowning of their sins.*]

Of the Antients before the world crowded into the Church, I never made question: Such as *Clemens*, *Polycarp*, *Ignatius*, *Irenæus*, and the rest.

How oft I have praised holy *Cyprian*, and the *African* Bishops and Councils, he sometime confesseth.

What I say of *Atticus*, *Proclus*, and other peaceable Bishops, you may see *p.* 17. and very oft. Yea of the Bishops of many Sects; much of the *Albigenses*, &c. *p.* 17, 18. Yea

Yea of the good that was done by the very worldly sort *p.* 18, 19, 20. Yea of the Papists Bishops that were pious *p.* 20. § 46.

And § 47. I vindicate the excellency of the Sacred Office. And § 53, 58, 59, 60. I plead for Episcopacy it self in the justifiable species of it.

§ 2. But perhaps he will say, that at least I say more of their faults than their virtues: I answer, of such good Bishops as *Cyprian, Basil, Greg. Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustin, Hillary, Martin*, &c. I speak of their virtues and nothing at all (that I remember) of their faults. Of such as *Theophilus*, and *Cyril Alexandri.* and *Epiphanius, &c.* I speak of their virtues and some of their faults (as the scripture doth of many good mens.) Of the more ambitious, turbulent sort, I speak only or mostly of their faults: For I profess not to write a History of their lives, but to inform the ignorant what Spirit it is that brought in Church tyranny and divisions. I denyed none of their virtues, though it was not my work to record them.

While I am confuting the Errours of your book, do I wrong you unless I write a Catalogue of your good works. *Morney, Illyricus*, and many others have gathered a *Catalogue* of old witnesses for Protestant Verities. And Bishop *Morton* hath cited multitudes of Papists against their party: Have they wronged them because they have not also cited all that the same said for the *Roman* cause? I have mentioned the virtues of some of the Popes, even of *Greg.* 7. but of many others I have only mentioned their vices: This is not to deny any good that is in them: Nor do you accuse your selves of any injustice when you tell the world how bad men the Parliaments have bin, and how bad *Cromwell* and the Armies, and how bad the Nonconformists are, and I in particular, without naming any of their good deeds or virtues: Because it is not your business.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of his Accusation that I do all in spite and malice against Bishops, and as using ill language of them.

§ 1. *Answ.* 1. Spite and Malice are heart sins: If the same effect may come from other Causes, how know you that these are the Cause?

Ans. 2. Is it from Spight and Malice that Protestants commonly describe the vices of the Popes, such as *Greg.* 7. *Sergius*, *Alexandr.* 3. *Boniface* 8. *Joh.* 12. and 13. & 22, & 23. & *Eugen.* 4. *&c.* And also that they so hardly speak of the *Jesuites*, Yea and Papists commonly? Sure it may come from some other cause.

Ans. 3. Is it from Spight and Malice that you recite the tumults of the *German* Anabaptists, the faults of those at *Munster*, the Errours of *David George*, the many Enthusiastick Sects described by *Beckman Exercit.* (of whom many as *Thaulerus*, *Kempis*, *Behmen* had much very commendable; and *Grotius* praised *Joh. Arndt.*) Is it from Malice that the Familists, Seekers, Quakers, Anabaptists, *&c.* are usually by your party described by their faults, without any mention of their goodness?

Ans. 4. Is it from Spight and Malice that your Party have written what they have done of the great faultiness of the Nonconformists, both former and latter; and that *Calvinists* are so odiously represented, that the Reformation by them is described by *Heylin* and others as Rebellious? That such books are written as *Heylins Aerius Redivivus*, *H. Fowlis*, the *Evangel. Armatum*, The *Eccles. Polit.* the Friendly Debate, the Counterminer, the Vindicat. of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the pretended second part, (which is a continued Calumny against my self, so full of particular falshoods as are not to be without a tedious Volume answered: And a multitude such written to render the Nonconformists odious and unsufferable. If all these be not written in Malice, how know you that mine were?

Ans. 5. And whereas some pretending moderation accuse me of too bad provoking language, 1. Is there any Comparison between the language of any of these books, or yours and Dr. *Sherlock's*

Sherlock's and mine? Read but Learned Godly moderate Bishop *Downam* his Defence of his Visit. sermon, his frequent charges [of shameless, impudent Lying, and much more] against a Nonconformist that gave him no such language. Read but the ordinary Writings of such as Bishop *Bancroft*, Dr. *Sutcliff*, and most others against the Old Nonconformists; and of the *Lutherans* against the *Calvinists*, even men that I am persuaded meant honestly, but by Faction were exasperated, as *Hunnius*, *Brentius*, *Morlinus*, *Marbachius*, *Snepfius*, *Wigandus*, *Heshusius*, *Andreas*, *Selnecerus*, *Heerbrand*, *Calovius*, and many such. Read but our Grammarians, such as you may find in the many Volumes of the Collections of *Janus Gruterus*, even those of *Cramer*, and *Phil. Paræus*, and others against himself; where *Fools*, *Knaves*, *Lyars*, *Sots*, and worse, make up much of the style.

Read but our Old Grammarian Reformers against the Popish Priests, and Schoolmen, I mean *Erasmus*, *Hutten*, *Faber*, and the rest, what Scorns their Writings do abound with.

I will not refer you to the Queen of *Navarre*, and *Stephanus* his *World of Wonders*, against the Priests, lest you think I approve of the excess.

Yea read but the Writings of our famous Learned Criticks, *Jul.* and *Joseph Scaliger*, *Heinsius*, *Salmasius*, &c. from whom the railing Jesuite *Labbe* took advantage to say, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 820. [" *Ri-*
" *veto præiverat Josephus Scaliger, homo utique modestissimus,*
" *qui Editores S. Irenæi vocat, clamosos, maledicentissimos.*
" *Cercopas, Tartareos, Pyriphlegethontas, virulentiæ & probrorum*
" *concionatores, & editionem colonienſem, cloacam Sycophantiarum,*
" *latrinam convitiorum, & stabulum insciti.*] Through God's great mercy, while *Malignity* is the Complexion of the Serpent's Seed, and *Lying* is their Breath, and *Murder* is their Work, the names of all these sins are odious in the world, and guilt is impatient, and cannot endure its own name.

Should I but mention the Language of Papists, how they represent the holiest Protestants as Lyars, Deceivers, Devils, intolerable, whom it is as lawful to kill as Dogs, Foxes or Toads, it would concern none but those of you that use to say, I had rather be a Papist than a Puritane, or Presbyterian; or those that renounce Communion with us, and own it with the Church of *Rome*; who are, alas, too many. Such Language as *Labbe*'s, *Vol.* 1. *p.* 819. is of the sweeter sort, *viz.* " *Quisquis es salutis*

" *tuæ*

" *tuæ amans, Omnes illico Calviniſtas, Lutheranos, Sociniaños*
" *Anabaptiſtas, ſimileſque generis humani peſtes, Cacodæmonism*
" *inſtar execrabere.* This is but what we daily hear: But while we hear it in a Language ſo very like from the Papiſts, and the Pulpits and Preſs, and *Roger Le Strange* is become the Church's Advocate and Mouth, it will harden them that did ill joyn together *Popery* and *Prelacy* in their rejections.

Honeſt *Thuanus* is amiable and honourable for Speaking well of all that deſerved it, without partiality: But *Gerh. Voſſius* is put to defend his Father-in-law *Junius* againſt his unjuſt cenſure. Indeed *Junius* was a man of Eminent peaceableneſs and moderation, (I would *Arminius* and he had been the utmoſt proſecutors of that Controverſie, notwithſtanding Dr. *Twiſſes* undervaluing his skill in School Divinity) And few men were more unlike *Thuanus* his ill Character than *Junius*: But Dr *Manton* hath told me that he hath been fully informed that it was not *Junius* that *Thuanus* meant but another that dyed that year (which *Junius* did not) and that by ſome ill chance a wrong name was put in Contrary to *Thuanus* intent.

§ 2. Dr. *Burnet* is a man whom I much value and honour, and pleadeth much for peace and moderation, and therefore much the more amiable to me: I thank him for his reproof of me to my face; but becauſe he goeth on to vend it as juſt behind my back, where I cannot anſwer him, I muſt do it here. He ſaith that [*I began and that with unchriſtian, provoking language againſt the Conformiſts in my firſt Plea for peace, which cauſed all the ſucceeding heats.*]

Anſ. 1. I have to him and oft in print appealed to humanity and common ſence whether one that was ſeventeen years ſilent, & communicated in the Pariſh Churches, and under ſcorns, and ejection, impriſonment & mulcts did peaceably continue Communion with them without reply or ſelf defence, and never wrote againſt them, till they had long called out to him to give them an account of the reaſons of his Nonconformity, and then durſt not provoke them by a diſpute, but barely named the matters which we judge unlawful, profeſſing not to be the Accuſer of Conformiſts, but only to anſwer the Call of Parliament-men, Biſhops, and others that urged us, and threatned us if we would not tell them what we ſtuck at; and made this the Juſtification of their proſecution of many hundred men: I ſay, whether ſuch a

man had a Call to ſpeak? When the King Licenſed us, I had before briefly defended our Preaching as Licenſed: But being thus ſummoned by our Proſecutors and Superiours, I told them what we judged unlawful; and was this a beginning of the Flame? Was Seventeen years Poverty, Prohibition and Proſecution, and all this Importunity, no provocation or call to ſpeak? Did this begin? If he were in the Houſe of Correction, and were beaten but Seventeen years, or Seven years, to confeſs the Cauſe for which he ſuffered, and at laſt confeſſed it, and one ſhould ſay, This was the beginning of the ſtrife, Would he take this for a good Hiſtorian? And if he had written Hiſtory, would this report advance the credit of it?

§ 3. But the ſecond thing accuſed, is the unchriſtian Language of that Book. *Anſw.* Doth a general Accuſation ſignifie more ill of the accuſer, or of the accuſed, if it be not proved by particular Inſtances? I urged him to name the unchriſtian words, and I remember but two Inſtances he gave me.

The firſt is, that I uſe the word [*untruths*] againſt my Accuſers. And 1. I think the Reader will very rarely find that word in that Book. 2. Is this ſo harſh as the common charge of *Lying*, uſed even by the moſt Learned ſober Conformiſts? 3. I thought it had been a modeſt word: What ſhall a man ſay when ſuch Volumes of Slander are publiſhed againſt him and others, as tends to preach all their Neighbours into hatred and perſecution of them? Alas! Doth it increaſe our crime to ſay, It *is untrue?* How ſhall we then anſwer for our ſelves at any Bar? Is it tollerable voluminouſly to tell the World down-right falſhoods of us? and is it railing for us to ſay, [*They are untrue?*] What's this but like him that run a man thorow in wrath with his Sword, and indicted him for crying, oh? This is the Church Juſtice even of our moderate Hiſtorians.

§ 4. But he ſaith, I ſhould not call it [a *falſhood*, or *untruth*] but a *miſtake*. *Anſw.* This is a ſharper word; for it ſignifieth the fault of the miſtaker uſually; whereas by ſpeaking *de objecto*, that it is *falſe*, I leave it to others how far the reporter is to be blamed. But ſure moſt Logical *Diſputations* are Railings, if the words [*falſum*] and [*fallacia*] be ſuch.

§ 5. About a month or ſix weeks ago the Obſervator, the Churches Advocate publiſhed, That ["a Captain of Horſe of "the King's, had the fortune to be diſmounted, wounded and "ſtript,

"ſtript, and a Chaplain (naming me before) cut from about his "neck a Medal, which the King had given him, and the Soul-"diers ſpared in the heat of blood] I ſent him word how falſe this was: I never ſaw the man in my life that I know of; much leſs ever medled with him: But was in a Houſe where a Souldier brought a ſmall ſilver-guilt Medal, about the bigneſs of a big Shilling, and ſaid, he took it from about the neck of one Captain *Jennings*, whoſe Life he ſpared: He offered it to ſale, and no one offering him more, I gave him eighteen pence for it in 1643. as I remember: And about 1648. hearing where Captain *Jennings* was, ſuppoſing it might be of great uſe to him, I ſent it him as a gift by one Mr. *Sommerfield*.] And this ſlander is all the thanks I had. The Church-Advocate wrote me back, that he had it formally atteſted. I craved as a favour of him to tell me if Captain *Jennings* be living, how I might write to him. He anſwers me, that one was out of the way that he muſt firſt ſpeak with, and I ſhould ſhortly hear from him. The next I heard was as a ſecond part of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, the foreſaid Book full of cruel falſhood, taken from my having been for the Parliament, and from many diſtorted words of mine: Now when this Book renders me worſe than a Jew, or Heathen, and unfit to live, ſome I fear will tell abroad that I am a Traitor, for ſaying, that [*It is ſlanderous or untrue.*]

§ 6. His ſecond Inſtance was theſe words of mine ["*Pardon* "*me for ſaying, I think that Mr.* Tombs *hath ſaid more like truth* "*for Anabaptiſtry, the late* Hungarian *for Polygamy, many for* "*Drunkenneſs, Stealing, and Lying, in caſes of Neceſſity, than ever* "*I yet read for the Lawfulneſs of all that I have here deſcribed.*]

Anſw. 1. Is there any Railing or unchriſtian Language in theſe words? which be they?

Anſw. 2. Do I here ſpeak of any but my ſelf and the Nonconformiſts? Do I not proteſt againſt accuſing others, and only ſay, what it would be to me, ſhould I conform? And muſt I not, when importuned by Biſhops, Prieſts and Rulers, ſay what I fear, leſt others ſhould think it intimateth their guiltineſs? Can I help that?

Anſw. 3 Did that man ever underſtandingly conſider the matter, who can doubt of the truth of what I ſay?

I. On the one ſide how *heinous* and *many* the ſins that *we fear* are, if we ſhould conform, I muſt not again name, for that's it that provoketh.

II. Now as to the Compariſon;

1. I'le appeal to Learned Biſhop *Barlow* whether Mr. *Tombs* hath not made the Caſe of Anabaptiſtry more difficult? Let them that deny it confute him better than I have done.

2. And why doth none anſwer the *Hungarians* book for Polygamy if it be eaſier done than the task in queſtion. I have known the man that maintained, that if a King had a barren wife, and his Kingdom like to be undone by a deſtructive ſucceſſor, he might as lawfully take another wife, as *Adams* Children might marry inceſtuouſly. And indeed the many unreproved inſtances of Polygamy in *Abraham, Jacob, Moſes, David, Solomon, &c.* will allow men more pretence for it, than ever I ſaw brought for all (I ſay, but For all) that I have named in that book.

3. And many Phyſicians have ſaid ſo much (though amiſs) for the lawfulneſs of a Drunken Cup inſtead of a Vomit & a Cordial in ſome diſeaſes, as have made it a harder caſe than ours ſeems to me: And I ſay not what it ſeems to others.

4. And *de neceſſario concubitu legantur quæ a medicis dicuntur de furore uterino.*

5. And for ſtealing nothing but preſent food to ſave life, he that Conſiders what God allowed a man to take that went through an Orchard, Vineyard or Corn-field, and what the Law of nature is, and whether the Kings Army on whoſe ſtrength the Safety of King & Kingdom depends, may not violently take food without the owners conſent rather than periſh, will find it harder to juſtifie the denying Chriſtendom and Communion to godly Perſons that ſcruple our ſort of God Fathers, Croſſing and Kneeling, *&c.* than to confute the aforeſaid ſtealing, or that which is meerly to ſave life.

6. And as for Lying in caſes of neceſſity, No leſs men of their own party than *Grotius de Jure Belli* and Biſhop *Jer. Taylor* in *Duct. Dubit.* have written for it. And though I be againſt it, and many Conformiſts for it, yet I will not deny but if the Life of the King might be ſaved among Enemies by a Lie; or the Life of a Patient by his Phyſicians deceiving him by a Lie, much more may be pretended for it, than for all the heinous ſin which I fear.

§ 7. And if theſe words be uncharitable Railing, what means have we left to give them that demand it, the Reaſons of our Nonconformity?

What

What if we had gone further, and taken it for a crying Church Crime, and called all the Clergy to Repentance? If that which we judge ſinful be not ſo, let them confute us: If it be ſo, and as great as we fear, is it not our duty to bewail it, and mourn for it? *Ezek.* 9.4. *Zeph.* 3. 17, &c. And is not mincing and extenuating great ſin, an implicit hardening men againſt Repentance? Should one Preach againſt Adultery, Fornication, Perjury, Murder, as about a doubtful Controverſie, or a ſmall thing, and ſay but [*Good men are on both ſides; I dare not ſay it is a ſin, though I dare not do it my ſelf: Or if it be one, it is but ſuch as good men are ordinarily guilty of: We muſt not judge one another.*] What were this but (worſe than *Eli* to his Sons) to cheriſh Sin, and Preach Impenitence, and ſerve Satan againſt the Evangelical Preaching of Repentance?

§ 8. For my Judgment, I profeſs it to be the duty of me, and all men, to uſe no Language of Good mens faults, no, though they turn Perſecutors upon ſome particular Errour, but what is conſiſtent with true Love to the men, and to cover their faults that are private, and meerly perſonal, as far as lawfully we may; but not to make light of publick, aggravated Crimes, ſuch as thoſe of *Hophni* and *Phinehas*; nor to ſhew indifferency towards Buyers and Sellers in the Temple; nor to ſtrengthen the Sin which threatneth a Land. If I thought that hundreds or thouſands of Chriſt's faithful Miniſters in any Country were unjuſtly hunted and forbidden to Preach the Goſpel to a People that truly need it, and this to the unavoidable dividing of the People, and the plain making way for a Forreign Juriſdiction, I ſhould take my ſelf as a guilty hinderer of Repentance, and Enemy to the Publick Safety, if I ſhould ſay only [*This is a doubtful Controverſie between Good, Wiſe, and Learned men.*]

Labbe ends his *To.* 1. as juſtifying his bittereſt Reproaches, with the Authority of Chriſt, *Peter, Paul, John, Jude, Ignatius.* And if he had only given great and publick ſins, the true names neceſſary to mens knowledge of them, for Repentance or Preſervation, thoſe Texts, and many more would have juſtified him.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Of his Suppoſition that I ſpeak againſt all Biſhops Councils.

§ 1 THis is not ſo. 1. I write oft for the great uſefulneſs of Councils. 2. I juſtly praiſe no ſmall number of them, eſpecially before the great Riſing of the Biſhops, for the firſt 300 or 400 years: He once acknowledgeth it of the *African* Councils: And he might have ſeen the like of many *Spaniſh*, and ſome *French* and *Germane* Councils: The *Engliſh* I little medled with. 3. The Firſt General Council at *Nice* I juſtly honour; yea and the Three following, and many more than three, for the ſoundneſs of their Faith, and as having many very laudable perſons in them; though I ſhew the ill effects of their contention and ambition.

I have heard ſome Conformiſts confeſs the great Learning and piety of the *Weſtminiſter* Synod in 1642. and of the Synod of *Dort*, where we had Delegates: and yet ſharplier ſpeak againſt the Acts of both by far, than I have done by any ſuch pious Perſons. Even they that have honoured Biſhop *Carlton*, Biſhop *Hall*, Biſhop *Davenant*, Dr. *Ward*, *&c.* that were there, have yet bitterly reproached the Decrees which they ſubſcribed. And how many as well as Dr *Heylin* have written and ſpoken ill of A. Biſhop *Uſher*, of A. Biſhop *Abbot*, A. Biſhop *Grindal*, A. Biſhop *Parker* (*yea of* A. Biſhop *Whitguift* for the *Lambeth*-Articles which I juſtifie not) who yet have a great honour both for Biſhops and their Councils.

§ 2. But I confeſs I am much of *Nazianzen*'s mind, and I think I am no more againſt them in the general than he was. And I am againſt our ſubjection to the Juriſdiction of Forreign Councils, and the uſe that the Pope and ambitious Clergy have made of them, to become Maſters of Princes and of the world: I am not for *Ebbo*'s *French* Council which depoſed *Ludov. Pius*, nor for making them either the Popes Army, or the Army of Patriacks againſt each other or of ſuch Princes as *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, *Theodoſius junior*, *Anaſtaſius Philippicus*, *Juſtinian*, *Irene*, *&c.* to fulfill their own miſtaken wills, how honeſt ſoever the men might

might be. Much less am I for such work as the Council at *Lateran sub Innoc.* 3 made, no nor that at *Florence*.

§ 3 And I take it for an Act of great Prudence in this my accuser, while he is vindicating Bishops Councils, to go no further than the four first General, when it is many hundred that I have mentioned. And is it not really an intimated accusation of them to vindicate so few of above 400. And those such as for their faith we all own.

And yet a man would think by the strein of his style and language that it were at least the greater part of Conncils that he were pleading for. I say still as Bishop *Bilson* and other Protestants: Well ordered sound Councils we owe great respect and honour to, for Counsel, strength and Concord, but *subjection and Obedience*, saith he, *We* owe *Them* none, (save as we are bid, be all subject one to another, and serve one another in Love.)

§ 4. And now I leave any impartial man to judge what answer such a book deserved, which goeth upon all these forementioned untrue suppositions.

CHAP. XIV.

Some mens Credit about ancient Church History, may be conjectured at by their Reports of the History of the time and place that we live in.

§ 1. BY their History of late and present things we may conjecture at the Credit of not Mr. *M's.* but others of the Clergy-accusers and Prosecutors of their Brethren. Almost all that I remember that write against me, agree in such misreporting matters of fact, yea the most publick, of the persons, place and time, which our senses have given us notice of, that we must believe them with as great difficulty as we must believe Transubstantiation, even in opposition to all our senses and experience. And whether those men be fit Vindicaters of the Bishops and Councils above a Thousand years ago (which are blamed by the Historians of their own Age, and by their own Confessions, and by their most fervent Defenders) who notoriously misreport the persons, and actions of their own Place and Age, I think it is not hard to judge. I will

I will instance in Twenty particulars of publick notice; for those against particular persons, even my self, are not to be numbred.

I. It is now commonly taken for true, that the present Nonconformists, who gave in their Desires for Concord 1660. are of the same Judgment as those called Nonconformists heretofore, and whatever can be raked up out of *Christ. Goodman*, *Knox*, *Kilby*, or is reported by *Bancroft*, is partly chargeable on them, when as their proposed Desires yet shew the world that they never made any motion against many things by those aforesaid scrupled, in Doctrine, Worship, and Ceremony.

And it is commonly supposed by them, that the present Conformity is but the same as the Old, and the Case no harder to us: And this notwithstanding all the still visible Acts and Alterations, and Additions, which attest the contrary to all the world.

II. In most of their Invectives the present Nonconformists are argued against, as if they had been in the Civil War against the King; or had been guilty of it more than the Conformists. And that War is made a Reason of their Silencing; whereas so few of them had any hand in it, that I have many times told them, that if they will Silence none but those that they can prove guilty of any War, or Rebellion, or Sedition, the rest of us will give them a thousand Thanks, though we suffer our selves. Few of the present Nonconformists were then in the Ministry, and of those few that were, few now living meddled with War.

III. They are so confident that the Parliament and Army that began the War in *England*, were Nonconformists, yea Presbyterians, and not of the Church of *England*, that Mr. *Hinkley*, & here Mr. *Morrice*, make a renouncing of their Senses or Understandings necessary to the believing of it. And yet they might as well tell us, that they were all Turks or Papists. Are not a Parliament and an Army things publick enough to be known in the same Age? When we name to them the Chief Lords and Commons, and Chief Commanders, yet (and lately) living, who are known still to live in their own Communion; and when we challenge them to name Three Presbyterians that were then in the House of Lords, or the House of Commons; or many that were at first Commanders in the Army; and we name them the Men that then Commanded, who were commonly known

to

to be Conformists of the Church of *England*. And if they will not believe their present practice and profession they may yet go to them and be satisfied from their own mouths what were their former Principles. I have told them of a most credible Member of that Parliament yet living, who hath oft profest to me that he knew but one Presbyterian in the House of Commons when the war began, and I have named that one man to them, to try if they can name another. I expect not that they should believe me, or such other concerning those whom we knew: But they may believe the men themselves yet living, & their most familiar Friends.

Yea the Records of many foregoing Parliaments, with *Laud*'s Life written by Dr. *Heylin* fully sheweth them that the difference arose 1. About the fear of Popery, (and *Arminianism* as they thought tending towards it) 2. About Property, Loan-mony, Knight-mony and after Ship-mony, &c. 3. About Imprisonment of members and other Gentlemen. And these were still the quarrel.

But saith Mr. *M. How then shall we believe our senses. Anſ.* See Reader, whether his most confident Errours about past things be any wonder. He is not so sure of what he saith of the old Prelates, or the *Nestorians, Eutychians, &c.* as he is that he must believe his Senses: And his very senses tell him that a Parliament, even Lords, Commons, and an Army, many of whom are yet living, were of another opinion in Religion than ever they were then acquainted with, and which was known to very few in *England* till afterward. And this contrary to their Profession and practice and the senses of their acquaintance. Lords are Persons of so publick notice that they may easily yet be informed of the living and the dead: In the Army the Chief Commanders were the E. of *Essex*, the E. of *Bedford* (yet living) Sir *John Merrick*, the E. of *Peterborough*, *Dolbiere*, the E. of *Stamford*, the Lord *Hastings* (E. of *Huntington*) the Lord *Rochford* (E. of *Dover*) the Lord *Fielding* (E. of *Denbigh*) the Lord *Mandevile* (E. of *Manchester*) the Lord *Roberts* (now Earl of *Radnor* and President of his Majesties Council) the Lord St. *Johns*, (killed at *Keinton* Fight.) Only the Lord *Say*, and Lord *Brook* were known Independents; and whether the Lord *Wharton* (yet living) was then for Bishops or against them I know not; but all the rest were of the Church of *England*. And so were the other Collonels, Sir *Henry Cholmley*, the late Lord *Hollis*, Col. *Will. Bampfield*, Col.

Tho. Grantham, Col. *Tho. Ballard*, C. Sir *William Fairfax*, Col. *Charles Essex*, Col. Lord *Willoughby* of *Parham*, Col. Sir *Will. Waller*, Col. *Edwin Sandys*, Cap. Lord *Grey* of *Grooby*; and I think then Sir *Will. Constable* and Col. *Hampden*. What mind Sir *Will. Balfoore* was of I know not: But I know his Country man Col. *Brown* was too far from a Puritane.

But saith Mr. *M.* [1. *It's well the Bishops had no share in it*] *Ans.* Let *Heylin* tell you what hand the difference between A. Bishop *Abbats* Church of *England* and *Laud*'s then little Party had in the preparations. 2. And was the A. Bishop of *York* no Bishop, who afterward was a Commander for the Parliament.

But saith he, [*I pray where were the Presbyterians when the Parliament took up Arms: Were they not then in being?*] *Ans.* An excellent Historian! that maintaineth Parliament and Army were such, as he knows not whether they were then in being. Yes Sir, they were in *Holland*, and *France* and *Geneva*, and *Scotland*; and in *England* there was one *John Ball*, and one Mr. *Langley*, and a few more such old Nonconformists that never were in Arms, and old *John Dod*, and one Mr. *Geree* that was against the war and dyed for grief of the Kings death: But among those called Puritans, few knew what Presbytery was, till the *Scots* afterward brought it in. Much less did Lords, Commons, and Army know it. In your sense Sir they were not then in being, and therefore could not fight.

It appears by *Bancroft* and others that there had been once Presbyterians in *England*: But they were dead, and few even of the few Nonconforming Ministers succeeded them in the Study of that point.

But saith he, [*Were they none of them in the house*] *Ans.* Yes, one [*or did they protest against the proceedings of the Episcopal and Erastians?* *Ans.* That one went with them. And *Non entis non sunt accidentia.*]

But saith he [*Can Mr. B. believe* (or *think any one else so weak as to be imposed on in a matter so notorious*) *that it was a Parliament of Episcopals*, and *Erastians and not Presbyterians that began the war?*]

Ans. Thus youngmen that know not whom they talk of can controle the most publick matter of fact by their conjectures. Go ask the worthy Master of the Rolls Sir *Harbottle Grimston*, whose Speeches were then printed: Ask Sir *Joh. Maynard* His Majesties

jesties Sergeant at Law who was one of them; or any other of them yet living. Ask them whether they knew themselves and their companions better than you, who it seems knew them not.

But saith he [*Were they Episcopals that voted down Episcopacy Root and Branch before the war begun*] *Ans.* 1. Have you proved that they did so? 2. Do you think that a contradiction? 1. They had got a belief that Bishop *Laud* had got such men into the Seats as were for a Syncretism with the Papists (described by *Heylin*) and against the Subjects Property and Liberty. And it was the *Men* and not the Office that offended them. 2. But because they were willing of the favour of the *Scots*, and those *Londoners* who were against the Bishops, they pleased them by voting down the present frame, intending to set up a moderate Episcopacy in its stead; Yea long after this when many Learned Divines in the Assembly declared themselves for Episcopacy, but not for Deans, Chancellors, &c. They altered the Covenant so as to describe the present frame only: And when the House of Lords took the Covenant, Mr. *Coleman* (an *Erastian*) gave it them openly, declaring, that it was not meer Episcopacy that this Covenant renounced, but only the *English* described Complicate form. And could they have had such Bishops as *Abbot* and the old Church of *England*, they had never gone thus far. 3. And they thought not Episcopacy itself so necessary, (though if moderate the best sort of Governments) as to hazard all for it, which they thought had been in danger. Even in 1640 *July* 17. They Voted a Diocesan in every County, with Twelve Divines to Govern.

But, saith he, [*Were they Episcopals that Petitioned the King at* York *for Reformation in Discipline and Worship then*? i.e. *for abolishing Episcopacy and Common-Prayer?*] *Answ.* 1. Reforming is not Abolishing. 2. I answered that as to the last. When they feared that the Old House would fall on their heads, they were for pulling of it down, and building a New one, after such a Model as Bishop *Usher* after gave, and the *Germane*, *Swedish*, and *Danish* Churches have; which they called the Primitive Episcopacy: But before they could do it, they needed the *Scots* help, who brought in the Covenant, which they chose rather than to fall into the hands of those of whom they had such thoughts and fears, as I need not now describe. *Prin*'s History of *Laud*'s Tryal describeth them.

I would ask this confident Hiſtorian (*whoſe ſenſes tell him what Religion men were of contrary to their daily practice of communicating in the Pariſh-Churches conformably*) whether the Longeſt Parliament of all, which made the Acts of Uniformity, the Corporation and Veſtry Acts, the Two Acts againſt Conventicles, the *Militia* Act, &c. were Presbyterian or Epiſcopal? Verily, if theſe were Presbyterians, I am none, nor ever will be: We ſhall then have a ſtrange definition of a Presbyterian, ſuch as will take in Biſhop *Sheldon*, Biſhop *Morley*, Biſhop *Gunning*, and ſuch others. If not, did not the fear of Popery make that very Parliament begin to look ſo ſowrely on the Clergy, as produced that which I need not tell you of? And did not moſt of the ſame men meet in the next Parliament after, and look yet more ſuſpiciouſly on the Clergy? And the next yet more? And doth it follow that they were not Epiſcopal but Presbyterian? But ſome men are confident againſt the Sun-light, and the moſt notorious Publick Evidence. But I muſt confeſs that ſuch have ſhaken my belief of the meer Moral Evidence of moſt Hiſtory, and left me only certain of that which hath Evidence, which is truly Natural, in the Natural Impoſſibility of Conſpiracy in a Lie.

There were men heretofore that would ſwear that man was a Puritane, who would not ſwear and drink with them, and would pray in their Families, and read the Scriptures on the Lord's Day, while others were dancing. And the word [*Puritane*] is now vulgarly changed into [*Presbyterian*] (by the Clergies Conduct.) And there are ſome Clergy-men that will ſay, a man is a Presbyterian, who reproves them for Drunkenneſs and Swearing, and other Crimes, ſpecially if he would not have Nonconformiſts ruined and laid in Gaol with Rogues. In this ſenſe I deny not but Lords, Commons and Army, had many Puritanes or Presbyterians among them, who yet never knew what Presbytery was.

But, ſaith Mr. *M.* [*Were they Epiſcopal who pray the King at* Oxford *to aboliſh A. Biſhops and Biſhops, &c. that entred into a Solemn League and Covenant againſt Epiſcopacy, and for Reforming the Church after the Presbyterian Platform, and ſet up Presbytery by ſo many Ordinances?*]

Anſw. Diſtingue tempora is none of this Hiſtorians Principles. How long after the War begun was this Petition at *Oxford*, this Covenant, and theſe Ordinances? He proveth them Preſbyterians

byterians at first when they knew not what it was, because they were for Presbytery a year or two after: *Negatur Sequela.* The *Scots* taught afterwards the Assembly, and them that which they never knew before, 2. And all these Petitions & Ordinances shewed not what they preferred as best, but what they preferred before expected ruine. The Issue proved this, and *Heylin* confesseth it, and saith, They never set up Presbytery in any one place (which yet is not true, though they did not force it.)

3. Do you not know now living, those Episcopal Conformists, who refuse no part of your Conformity, and are much against Presbytery, who since the Discovery of the Papists Plot, are so much afraid of Popery, and so confident that too many of the Clergy are prepared for it, that a little more would turn them from you, though they love Presbytery as little as they love your selves.

In a word, The Old Clergy and the Parliament Men agreed. The New Clergy in Bishop *Laud*'s time distasted them; & the *Scots* Presbyterians helping them in their straits, partly turned some of them, and partly imposed on them unpleasing conditions.

But saith he, [*The Erastians and Independents were at first inconsiderable, and acted joyntly with the Presbyterians, &c.*]

Answ. Thus is History delivered to the deluded World! Neither Independency nor Presbytery were understood by many till the War was begun. The *Scots* Commissioners by degrees acquainted them with Presbytery, and Mr. *Burton*'s Protestation Protested, and the five Dissenters with Independency: Two or three Independents were in the House of Lords, and some few in the House of Commons: It was Episcopal-men that made up the main Body: These were of two sorts: The one sort thought Episcopacy of Divine Institution, but not Chancellors, Deans and Chapters, Arch-Deacons, Officials, *&c.* The other sort thought that Episcopacy, not rampant, was the best Government *Jure humano*; But that the Magistrate being Chief, might set it up, or take it down, as he see most for the common good. These were called by some *Erastians:* And that these at first were inconsiderable, is History written in despight of Evidence. Let any man 1. Read what Parliaments formerly said; 2. And what many *English* Divines wrote for the *Jus humanum* against the *Jus Divinum*; and what Testimony *Prin* hath given of it; 3. And what Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath produced for it in his *Irenicon*;

4. And

4. And how commonly it was owned by Conformists then in Conference; 5. And how commonly the Lawyers were for the Humane Right; 6. Yea and the Civilians themselves; and then let him take this Historian's word, if he tell Posterity that the Parliament and Army were not *English* men.

IV. These Historians candidly tell the world, that the Nonconformists, who offered their Desires for Concord 1660. were Presbyterians, and so are most of the Nonconformists now. Whereas they never made one motion for Presbytery, for Lay-Elders, for Ruling Classes or Assemblies, nor against Episcopacy; but only offered the Paper called A. Bishop *Usher*'s Reduction of Episcopacy to the Primitive Form; wherein neither A. Bishops, nor Bishops, nor Deans and Chapters. Archdeacons, were taken down, or any of their Revenues, Lordships, or Parliament-Power. This is Presbytery with these Historians.

V. They make the world believe that the main Body of the Conformists, are such as suffered for the King, or complied not with the Directory and Times of Usurpation: Whereas it's publickly notorious, that there are about 9000 Parish-Churches in *England*, besides many hundred Chappels, & many Churches that had more than one Minister. And almost all these complied with the Times or Directory, as the Nonconformists did: And of all these, it was but about 2000 that Conformed not; so that 7000 or 8000 of them that had kept in, did on a sudden turn Conformists. And divers that had been in Arms for the Parliament: Yea, some that had written for the Engagement when I wrote against it; yea some that had spoken or written *tantum non* a Justification of the Killing of the King. And of those that joyned with us in our Proposals for Concord, Dr. *Worth*, and Dr. *Reignolds* were made Bishops, and divers others did Conform.

VI. These Historians would make the world believe that the Present Church, and such as they, did more than the Parliamentarians, and Presbyterians, and Nonconformists, to restore the King; when it is notoriously known, how oft their Attempts were defeated, and what the *Scots* Army under *Hamilton* underwent, to say nothing of the next; and of the Lord *Delamore*'s Attempt, and what the Restored Parliament did: But sure I am, that the Old Parliament Souldiers, and Presbyterian Commanders and Souldiers in General *Monk*'s Army, with those in *England* and *Ireland* that joyned with him, and Sir *Thomas Allen*

Lord

Lord Mayor, with the *Londoners*, at the perſuaſion of the Preſbyterian Miniſters, drawing General *Monk* to joyn with them, did the main work, which the Council and Parliament after finiſhed. When moſt of theſe men that will not endure the oblivion of Diſcords, nor the Reconciling and Union of the King's Subjects, do but ſtart up to revile others, and blow the Coals again, and reap the fruit of other mens labours, that deſire but to live in Peace.

VII. That there are able worthy men that Conform, we are far from denying; and we earneſtly deſire their Concord, and the ſucceſs of their Labour, and I hope love them as our ſelves. But whereas the Hiſtory of this Party doth proclaim how much better and abler Miniſters than the Nonconformiſts are generally put into their Places, that are no Novices or Ignorant Youths, no Drunkards, nor ſcandalous, but more laborious, skilful Labourers, I will ſay nothing, but let the Countries judge.

VIII. And whether it be true that there is no need of the Nonconformiſts Miniſtry, but the Churches are ſufficiently ſupplied without them, both as to the number and quality of their Teachers, I have in my Apology enquired; and with godly men it's eaſily judged.

IX. And whether it be true, that it was only for the Kings or Biſhops cauſe that the Parliament put out all, or moſt of them that were heretofore removed, I leave to the Witneſſes and Articles againſt them. I am ſure I and my neighbour Miniſters petitioned that none that were tolerable pious Miniſters, might be put out for being for the King or Biſhops.

X. It is commonly now recorded and reported that the Preſbyterians and thoſe that now conform not put down Catechizing, and turned the Creed, Lords prayer and Decalogue out of the Church Service. Whereas (if ſome few Independents did any of this, it is more than I know, but) in all our Countrey, and where I came, I remember no Churches that did not uſe the Creed openly at their baptizing any, and the Decalogue frequently read out of *Exod.* 20. or *Deut.* 5. and the Lords prayer frequently; as we did conſtantly. But ſome thought that we were not bound to uſe it every time they prayed. And the Directory commendeth all theſe to them. And all our Countrey agreed not only to Catechize publickly, but to take larger time

on

on the week daies to Catechize every family.

XI. Theſe Hiſtorians ſay that I and ſuch others take the things which we conform not to, to be but inconveniences and not ſins; And that we keep the Nation in Schiſme while we confeſs the things to be but Indifferent And our writings are viſible in which we profeſt the contrary, and laboured by many arguments to prove it and proteſted that we would conform if we took them not to be ſins. And we gave in a Catalogue of what we judged to be ſins: And this before the New Conformity was impoſed: And ſince the fierceſt diſpleaſure is againſt us for telling them what we account Sin, and how great: When many years together our Rulers and the People were told that we confeſſed them indifferent and refuſed them but to avoid offending our followers.

XII. We frequently hear from them that we oppoſe Epiſcopacy becauſe we cannot be Biſhops our ſelves: When its known that nothing could more put men out of all ſuch hopes than the Presbyterians Endeavours that both their power and wealth ſhould be taken down: And he that hath any deſires of a Biſhoprick ſhould ſure be for the keeping of them up. And the ſame men reprove us for refuſing Biſhopricks and Deanries, and ſay we did it to pleaſe the People.

XIV. The new Hiſtorians would make us believe that the Reformed Church of *England* before Biſhop *Lauds* time were of their mind that now call themſelves Biſhops and Doctors of the Church of *England*, in holding as they do, that there is an Univerſal humane Soveraignty with Legiſlative and Judicial power over all the Churches on earth: and that this is in Councils, or an Univerſal Colledge of Biſhops; of which the Pope may be allowed to be preſident, and *Principium Unitatis*, &c. and that he muſt be obeyed as Patriarch of the Weſt; and ſo we muſt be under a forreign Juriſdiction. Whereas it is notoriouſly known that before Biſhop *Lauds* time the doctrine of this Church was quite Contrary, as may be ſeen at large in the Apology, the Articles of Religion, the writings of the Biſhops and Doctors; Yea they writ copiouſly to prove that the Pope is Antichriſt, and put it into their Liturgy. And Dr. *Heylin* tells us that the Reaſon why Biſhop *Land* got it out was, that it might not offend the Papiſts and hinder our reconciliation with them; And the Oath of Supremacy ſweareth us againſt all forreign Juriſdiction.

XV. The ſame Hiſtorians would make us believe that theſe

mens

mens doctrine is now the doctrine of the Church of *England* or agreeable to it. Whereas the Oath of Allegiance is ſtill in force, and ſo are the Homilies, and the Articles of Religion and the Laws and Canons for the Kings Supremacy againſt all forreign Juriſdiction. And there is no change made which alloweth of their doctrine: And the Church doctrine muſt be known by its publick writings, and not by the opinions of new riſen men.

XVI. The new Hiſtorians make the Nonconforming Miniſters to be men groſly ignorant, preaching falſe doctrine, of wicked principles and lives, and not fit to be ſuffered out of Gaols. And yet theſe 19. or 20. years how few of them have been convict of any falſe doctrine? And I have not heard of four in *England* that have ever been convict ſince they were caſt out, of being once drunk, or fornicating, cheating, ſwearing, or any immorality, unleſs preaching and not ſwearing, Subſcribing, &c. be ſuch, nor for falſe doctrine.

XVII. The new Hiſtorians have made thouſands believe that the doctrine or opinions of the Nonconformiſts is for ſedition and rebellion; And that it is for this that they refuſe to renounce the obligation of the Covenant as to all men beſides themſelves and that they refuſe to ſubſcribe that it is not lawful on any pretence whatſoever to take Arms againſt any Commiſſioned by the King. Whereas we have at large in a ſecond Plea for peace opened our judgments about Loyalty and obedience, and none of them will tell us what they would have more, nor where our profeſſion is too ſhort or faulty. Nor have they convict any of my acquaintance of preaching any diſloyal doctrine.

XVIII. Yea they have by writing, preaching and talking made multitudes believe that the Nonconformiſts or Presbyterians have been long hatching a rebellion againſt the King, and have a Plot to take down Monarchy under pretence of oppoſing Popery. And how far theſe Hiſtorians are to be believed, true Proteſtants by this time partly underſtand.

XIX. Yea theſe Hiſtorians have made multitudes believe that the Parliaments that have been diſolved here of late years have been deſigning to change the Government of Church and ſtate, under pretence of oppoſing Popery. As if that Parliament that did that for them and againſt us which is done, and made all the Acts which are for the Renunciation of the Covenant, and for all the Declarations, Subſcriptions and Practices Impoſed, and for Fining us 20 *l.* and 40 *l.* a Sermon, and laying us in Gaols,

had been for Nonconformists, and against Episcopacy; and they that made the *Militia* Act, and such other had been against the King, or his Prerogative: Or the other following had not been of the same Religion.

XX. But the boldest part of their History, is their description of the two sorts of the People in *England*, those that are for the present Nonconformists, and those that are against them. Those that are against them, they account the most Religious, Temperate, Chast, Loyal, Credible, and in a word, the best people through the Land (for of our Rulers I am not speaking.) And those that are for the Nonconforming Ministers, they defame as the most proud, hypocritical, treacherous, disloyal, covetous, false, and in a word, the worst people in the Land; or as *Fowls* saith, the worst of all mankind, and unfit to live in humane Society. How long will it be ere the sober people of this Land believe this Character? One would think that the quality of the common Inhabitants of the Land should not be a Controversie, or unknown thing. All that I will say to this History, is, to tell the Reader the utmost of my observation and experience from my Youth up, concerning these two sorts of men.

Where I was bred before 1640. (which was in divers places) I knew not one Presbyterian Clergy-man, nor Lay, and but three or four Nonconforming Ministers. Nay till Mr. *Ball* wrote for the Liturgy and against *Can*, and *Allen*, &c. and till Mr. *Burton* Published his Protestation protested, I never thought what Presbytery or Independency were, nor ever spake with a man that seemed to know it: And that was in 1641. when the War was brewing. In the place where I first lived, and the Country about, the People were of two sorts: The generality seemed to mind nothing seriously but the body and the world: They went to Church and would answer the Parson in Responds and thence go to dinner, and then to play: They never prayed in their families, but some of them going to bed, would say over the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, & some of them the *Hail Mary*: All the year long, not a serious word of holy things, or the Life to come, that I could hear of, proceeded from them. They read not the Scripture, nor any good Book or Catechism. Few of them could read, or had a Bible: They were of two ranks; the greater part were good Husbands as they called them, and savoured of nothing but their business or Interest in the World; the rest were Drunkards: Most were Swearers, but not equally: Both

sorts.

ſorts ſeemed utter ſtrangers to any more of Religion than I have named; and loved not to hear any ſerious talk of God, or Duty, or Sin, or the Goſpel, or Judgment, or the Life to come: But ſome more hated it than others: The other ſort were ſuch as had their Conſciences awakened to ſome regard of God and their Everlaſting State; and according to the various meaſures of their underſtanding, did ſpeak and live as ſerious in the Chriſtian Faith, and would much enquire what was Duty, and what was Sin, and how to pleaſe God, and to make ſure of Salvation; and made this their Buſineſs and Intereſt, as the reſt did the world. They read the Scripture, and ſuch Books as *The Practice of Piety*; *and* Dent's *Plain Man's Path Way*; *and* Dod *on the Commandments*, &c. They uſed to pray in their Families, and alone; ſome on the Book, and ſome without: They would not Swear, nor Curſe, nor take God's Name lightly: They feared all known ſin: They would go to the next Pariſh-Church to hear a Sermon when they had none at their own; would read the Scripture on the Lord's Day, when others were playing: Theſe were, where I lived, about the number of two or three Families in twenty; and theſe by the reſt were called Puritanes, and derided as Hypocrites and Preciſians, that would take on them to be Holy: And eſpecially if they told any one of his Swearing, Drunkenneſs, or Ungodlineſs, they were made the common ſcorn. Yet not one of many of them ever ſcrupled Conformity to Biſhops Liturgy or Ceremonies, and it was godly Conformable Miniſters that they went from home to hear: And theſe Miniſters being the ableſt Preachers, and of more ſerious Piety, were alſo the Objects of the Vulgar Obloquy as Puritanes and Preciſians themſelves; and accordingly ſpoke againſt by many of their Tribe, and envyed for being preferred by godly men.

This being the Condition of the Vulgar where I was, when I came into the acquaintance of many Perſons of Honour and Power, and reputed Learning, I found the ſame ſerioufneſs in Religion in ſome few before deſcribed, and the ſame daily ſcorn of that ſort of men in others, but differently cloathed: For theſe would talk more bitterly, but yet with a greater ſhew of reaſon againſt the other, than the ignorant Country People did: And they would ſometime talk of ſome Opinions in Religion, and ſome of them would uſe ſome of the Common-Prayer in

their Houſes, and ſome of them would ſwear, but ſeldom, and ſmall Oaths, and lived ſoberly and civilly; but ſerious talk of God or Godlineſs, or that which tended to ſearch and reform the Heart and Life, and ſeriouſly prepare for the Life to come, or to awaken Souls to a care of their State and Salvation, they would at leaſt be very weary to hear, if not deride as Puritanical. Mr. *Robert Bolton* a Conformiſt, hath fully opened all this of both ſorts in his *Diſcourſe of True Happineſs*, and *Directions for walking with God*: And how the name *Puritane* was then uſed.

This being the Fundamental Diviſion where I came, ſome of theſe that were called Puritanes and Hypocrites, for not being Hypocrites, but ſerious in the Religion they profeſſed, would ſometimes get together, and as Drunkards and Sporters would meet to drink and play, they would (in ſome very few places, where there were many of them) meet after Sermon on the Lord's Daies to Repeat the Conforming Miniſters Sermon, and ſing a Pſalm, and Pray. For this, and for going from their own Pariſh-Churches, they were firſt envied by the Readers, and dry Teachers, whom they ſometime went from, and next proſecuted by Apparitors, Officials, Archdeacons, Commiſſaries, Chancellors, and other Epiſcopal Inſtruments: For in former times there had been divers Presbyterian Nonconformiſts, who earneſtly pleaded for Pariſh-Diſcipline (as *Bucer* alſo did in *Oper. Anglic.*) And to ſubdue theſe, divers Canons were made; which ſerved the turn againſt theſe Meetings of the Conformable Puritanes, and going from their own Pariſh-Churches; though the Old Presbyterians were dead, and very few ſucceeded them. About as many Nonconformiſts as Counties were left; and thoſe few moſt ſtuck at Subſcription and Ceremonies, which were the hinderance of their Miniſtry; and but few of them ſtudied or underſtood the Presbyterian or Independent Diſciplinary Cauſes.

But when theſe Conformable Puritanes were thus proſecuted, it bred in them hard thoughts of the Biſhops and their Courts, as Enemies to ſerious Piety, and Perſecutors of that which they ſhould promote: Suffering bred this Opinion and Averſation. And the ungodly Rabble rejoyced at their troubles, and applauded the Biſhops for it, and were every where ready to ſet the Apparitors on them, or to ask them, Are you holier or wiſer than the Biſhops? And their Accuſations were readily entertained.

tertained: This much inclined them to hearken to them that were averſe to Conformity, when ſuch roſe up, and to ſuch as were more againſt the Biſhops, than there was cauſe; ſo that by this time, the Puritanes took the Biſhops to be Captains and the Chancellors, Archdeacons, Commiſſaries, Officials and Paritors, their Officers, and the Enemies of ſerious Godlineſs, and the vicious Rabble to be as their Army, to ſuppreſs true conſciencious Obedience to God, and care of mens Salvation. And the cenſured Clergy and Officers took the Cenſurers to be Schiſmaticks, and Enemies to the Church, unfit to be endured, and fit to be proſecuted with reproach and puniſhment; ſo that the ſaid Puritanes took it to be but the common Enmity that ſince *Cain*'s daies hath been in the world, between the Serpent's and the Woman's Seed: And when the perſons of Biſhops, Chancellors, Officials, Apparitors, *&c.* were come under ſuch a repute, it was eaſie to believe what ſhould be ſaid againſt their Office. And the more the Biſhops thought to cure this by puniſhment, the more they increaſed the Opinion, that they were perſecuting Enemies of Godlineſs, and the Captains of the Prophane.

And when ſuch ſinful Beginnings had prepared men, the Civil Contentions ariſing, thoſe called Puritanes, moſtly were againſt that ſide which they ſaw the Biſhops and their Neighbour Enemies for: And they were for the Parliament the rather, becauſe they ſeemed deſirous to Reform the Biſhops, and Reſtore the Liberty of thoſe whom they proſecuted for the manner of their ſerving God. Yet they deſired, where-ever I was, to have lived peaceably at home: But the Drunkards and Rabble that formerly hated them, when they ſaw the War beginning, grew inraged; and if a man did but Pray, and Sing a Pſalm in his houſe, they would cry [*Down with the Roundheads*] (a word then new made for them,) and put them in fear of ſudden violence, and afterwards brought the King's Souldiers to plunder them of their goods, and they were fain to run into holes to hide their perſons (*Martin Cruſius* in his *Turco-Græcia* deſcribeth much the like Caſe of his Father.) And when their Goods were gone, and their Lives in continual danger, they were forced to fly for Food and Shelter: To go among thoſe that hated them, they durſt not, when they could not dwell among ſuch at home. And thus thouſands run into the Parliaments Garriſons, and having nothing there to live upon, became Souldiers.

We

We had an honeſt very Old *Arminian* (Mr. *Nayler*) in *Coventry*, that was againſt the Parliaments Cauſe; and he would ſay, [*The King hath the beſt Cauſe, and the Parliament the beſt Men.*] And that he wondred how it came to paſs, that the generality of ſober Religious men, ſhould be all in the wrong, and the moſt Irreligious and Prophane, and Debauched be in the right.] But he knew but the Vulgar, and not the Grandees, who no doubt were many of them men of very laudable accompliſhments.

And as the feud of the Biſhops and their Officers and Curates againſt the aforeſaid exerciſes of Religion occaſioned this ſad Diviſion, ſo did the ſenſe of this in the minds of thoſe called Puritanes continue too long. Many a time have I ſeen abundance in great Perplexity, ſaying [We believed them that profeſſed that they took not Arms againſt the King, but to execute the Law on Delinquents and defend themſelves and the Kingdom from them: We abhor the Regicides and Uſurpers: We would reſtore the King, if we were ſtronger than the Army. And yet we are in doubt how far we ſhould actively contribute to our own calamity: For though the King deſerve more than we can do, we doubt not but the Biſhops will increaſe our Burdens and make greater havock in the Church than heretofore] And many ſate ſtill on this account, and as far as ever I could diſcern, next the Power of the Army, the fear of the Biſhops was the chief delay of the Kings return.

I knew not all *England*; but according to the Extent of my acquaintance, I have truly told you the quality of thoſe then called Puritans and of their Common adverſaries.

And on which ſide now proportionably are moſt of the moſt underſtanding, ſober, charitable, conſcionable, and ſeriouſly religious Perſons, and on which moſt of the contrary (not ſpeaking of any Magiſtrates) I think it neither my work, nor our New Hiſtorians to tell: For people that live among their neighbours, will believe their ſenſes and experience, what ever either he or I ſhall ſay. And I am well aſſured that this argument (which I think was not found) [*We cannot believe that God will ſuffer the Generality of the Religious to be deceived in ſo great a caſe, and the moſt of the debauched ignorant haters of ſerious Godlineſs to be in the right,*] did prevail with very many that could not try the Cauſe by the Laws and conſtitution of the Kingdom.

§ 2. If I ſhould recite the particular unjuſt reports of multitudes

titudes of these Writers it would be tiresome and loathsome: Yea all the mistakes of this Eminent Historian are too many to be named: But I will here name one which seems at once to smite and smile.

Pag. 27. [" *There is a temper which Mr.* B. *is acquainted* " *with that, is not to be prevailed on, either by threats or promises* " *from the Magistrate; and seems to hate nothing so much as compli-* " *ance with Superiors: There are some that scorn to preach by the* " *Licence of the Government, and place the Kingdom of Christ purely* " *in opposition to Law and Magistrates.*]

Answ. Note the credibility of this Historian. 1. Doth their accusation of my flattering the Usurpers (whom I more openly disowned than most of his Fraternity) agree with this?

2. Did my long and earnest Petitioning to be accepted but in a poor Curates place, though I Preacht for nothing, yea if it were but in some ignorant obscure Village, and only to preach over the Catechism, agree with this?

3. Doth my large profession of Subjection in my Second Plea for Peace not yet blamed by them herein agree with this?

4. I willingly took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and an Oath to be true to the King as his Chaplain in ordinary, and had this any such signification?

5. Did my begging in vain a License from Bishop *Morley*, and craving and obtaining one of Bishop *Sheldon*, signifie this?

6. But the smile is that one would think by these words, I might have preached by the Governours License and would not. And is that true? Did I not preach by the Kings License, and the Clergy blame me for it? And as for the Bishops License I do profess that it's yet in force, and I do preach by it. If I mistake it is not my refusing it. If he intimate as he seems, that by the Bishops License I might have had leave to preach in the Parish Churches, it's now too late: But I would I had known how to get it. I confess one Summer in the Countrey about 25 miles off, I did venture upon the Credit of my License (at *Amersham*, *Chesham*, *Rickmersworth*, &c.) But it was too pleasing work to me to be continued: One Church in *Southwark* I was once let into, but no more in or near *London*. I once craved leave of the moderate Bishop that now is, that without putting down the meeting where I was in that great Parish of St. *Martin's*, I might preach sometime there and once a day at the Chappel

which I built, which the Parish Incumbent useth, and that he would quiet the Justices to that end, and thought I had had his consent: But the Constables and other Officers stood from that day about a quarter of a year together every Lord's Day at the door of the former place of Assembly, to have apprehended me by the Justices warrant if I had gone. And never could I hear of a man in *London* that was willing I should come into his Pulpit; but the best have refused it. Nor did I much desire it here: For it is not to preach to them that have no need that is my request; but to such as cannot come into the Parish Church or otherwise truely need our help. Once I did try to have got leave two miles out of the City to have preacht a Kinswomans Funerall Sermon on the right of my License: But the Minister said, He must first ask the Bishop, and then denyed me.

Reader, these are the Historians that Charge me with misreport of ancient History, visible in the most partial Authors on the other side: Judge of them by their Report of the History of our Place and Age.

CHAP. XV.

Mr. M's. *way of getting belief, by a Magisterial condemning the most credible Historians, and authorizing whom he please.*

§ 1. IF we had not *Eusebius*, *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, how naked should we be left, and much unacquainted with the case of the Church from the Apostles; (Besides *Theodorets* History) till 440. And what a shake is given to the Credit of all these by Mr. *M.* and others of greater name?

Though *Eusebius* himself be by *Petavius* and many other Papists accounted an *Arian*, yea and seemingly proved such, and by *Bellarmine de Script. Eccles.* its said that *Athanasius* so calls him, and *Jerom* calls him the *Arian* Signifer and Prince, and the 7th General Council so judgeth him, yet *Socrates* vindicateth him, and thinks he is wronged: And indeed though his own Epistle written to his Flock be not justifyable, incautelous and unjustifyable words were too Common before his daies (as *Petavius* hath too fully proved) with those that we must not yet call *Arians*. But while *Bellarmine* and Mr. *M.* charge *Socrates* and *Sozomen*

Sozomen as *Novatians* that is Hereticks themselves, they deprive *Eusebius* of much of their defence, and render his History the more suspicious.

§ 2. And though I know Mr. *M.* hath more partners herein, I never saw yet any credible proof that either of them were *Novatians*: Good Christians are not ashamed nor afraid to make profession of their Religion. And they are so far from professing it, that they oft speak of the *Novatians* in disowning words. But they praised them for the good that is in them! And would not any impartial Historian do the like? Must a man rail at any party, or hide their Virtues or else be taken to be one of them? I confess that such as Mr. *M.* do fully acquit themselves from the suspicion of being Presbyterians or Nonconformists. But so did not A. Bishop *Grindall*, Bishop *Jewel*, A. Bishop *Abbot* A. Bishop *Usher*, and many more such. Sure Candor and Impartiality is Laudable in Historians; And *Thuanus* is most honoured for that. And notwithstanding Mr. *M's* assertions of the contrary, I profess my self a lover & honourer of the worth of many of the aspiring Bishops that corrupted the Church; and of many Popes, and of many that continue Church corruptions in the height; even many of the Papists Cardinals, Schoolmen and Jesuites. Who will not love and praise the excellent Learning of such as *Suarez*, *Vasquez*, *Victoria*, *Petavius* and abundance such? Who will not praise the piety of such as *Gerson*, *Borromæus*, *Sales*, and many others, though we nevertheless disown their Popery? For my part I highly value the Clearenes, of multitudes of the Schoolmen, and that they have not in whole loads of their volumes so much malicious railing as the Jesuits and many of our late Conformists have in a few sheets. Doth it follow that I am a Papist because I praise them, or that *Socrates* or *Sozomen* were *Novatians* because they speak well of their faith and piety.

There are abundance of Malignants, that acknowledge the Good Lives of those they call Puritanes (and if he had not had the late Wars between King and Parliament to fill all Mouths and Books against them, the Devil by this time might have been at a loss with what Accusations to reproach them. For he was put to use the *Voices* (no names) of [*Roundheads*, *Whigs*, &c. when their Revilers were called Drunkards, Swearers, Dam-me's, *&c.*] But they that confess the Good, reproach them as Hypocrites that do but counterfeit it. Doth this ac-

 knowledgment

knowledgment prove them Puritanes. I ſuppoſe Mr. *M.* knoweth that no ſmall number of Hiſtorians and Fathers confeſs the ſtrictneſs of the *Novatians* Lives, and yet were no *Novatians*. And *Conſtantine*'s words to *Aceſius* imply that he thought him ſingularly ſtrict. And Mr. *M.* ſaith Pref. [*The* Novatians, *ſaith the Author, did not ſuffer much by this Edict, being befriended by the Emperour, who had an eſteem for their Biſhop of* C. P. *upon the account of his Holineſs.*] And may not an Orthodox man confeſs the Piety of others?

§ 3. But Mr. *M.* is ſo Magiſterial as to ſay, *Pag.* 322. *The ſtory of* Theophilus, *and the Monks of* Nitria, *no reaſonable man can believe, as it is related by* Socrates *and* Sozomen, *without loving a malicious Lie.*] So that *Socrates* and *Sozomen* either believed not themſelves, or elſe *Loved a malicious Lie.*

And *Page* 319. he ſaith, [*The ſtory of* Theophilus *his charging* Iſidore *with double Letters, that whoever was Conquerour, he might apply himſelf to him in his name, is of the ſame piece with the reſt of* Socrates *his ſtory concerning that Biſhop; and in all probability an invention of one of the Monks of* Nitria.]

It ſeems this Hiſtorian believeth Old Hiſtorians, as the matters ſeem probable or improbable to himſelf. And ſo we may take him for the Univerſal Expoſitor of Hiſtory: It is not the Old Hiſtorians that we muſt believe, but his Conjectures. And thus he deals with divers others.

§ 4. For my part I profeſs, that before I had any Engagement in theſe Controverſies, ſince I firſt read them, I took *Socrates* and *Sozomen* to be two of the moſt credible Hiſtorians that the Church had till their Times, and of many an Age after them. I ſaid of them, as I uſe to do of *Thuanus*, A man may trace the footſteps of Knowledge, and impartial honeſty, and ſo of Veracity in their very ſtyle. And there are few of the judicious Cenſurers of Hiſtorians, but do tell us of far more uncertainties in *Euſebius*, and after in *Nicephorus*, and moſt that followed, (as far as I am acquainted with ſuch Cenſurers) than in theſe two. And if their Hiſtory be ſhaken, our loſs will not be ſmall. And I doubt not but the Anathematizing and Condemning Spirit hath done hurt, which hath made *Euſebius* an undoubted *Arian*, and *Theodoret*, firſt a *Neſtorian*, and after at the fifth General Council condemned ſome of his Writings, and impoſed it on the whole Chriſtian World to condemn them, though many never heard of them

them, and that made *Ruffinus* (and *Chryſoſtom*) *Originiſts*, and *Origen* a Heretick, condemned alſo by a General Council, and *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*, *Novatians*, *Epiphanius* an ignorant credulous Fabler, *Sulpitius Severus*, and *Beda*, two pious credulous Reporters of many feigned Miracles, and one a *Millenary*, *Nicephorus* a Fabler, *Anaſtaſius Bibl.* full of Falſhoods, *Philaſtrius* an ignorant Erroneous Hereticator, *Caſſianus* a *Semi-Pelagian*, *Caſſiodori Chronic. eſt farrago temulentiæ inquit Onuphrius Pan. Pene nunquam cum Euſebio convenit inquit Voſſius*, &c. I ſay, Though it be no wrong to the Church to take them for fallible, and ſuch as have miſtakes (which the *Engliſh* Articles ſay even of General Councils) yet it wrongfully ſhaketh all our belief of Church Hiſtory to call their Credit in matters of fact into queſtion for their Errours or opinions ſake, without good Evidence that either they were ignorant, miſ-informed or wilfully lied. But if the *Novatians* were more ſtrict & preciſe than others, it's rather like that they were more and not leſs credible than others, and made more or not leſs conſcience of a lye. Certainly that which the reſt named are charged with is ſomewhat more as to Hiſtorical Credit than to be *Novatians*: So that if theſe men had been *Novatians*, I ſhould yet ſay by the Complexion of their Hiſtory that They are two of our moſt uſeful and credible Church Hiſtorians.

§ 5. But when it ſerveth his turn he can gather out of *Sozomen* that even in *Conſtantine*'s time, *Conſtantinople* was [*Altogether a Chriſtian City*] Becauſe he mentioneth the great Enlargement of it; and great encreaſe of Chriſtianity: When as no man that lived could be a fitter judge of the number of Chriſtians in his time than *Chryſoſtom*: And he that conſidered that there and every where *Conſtantine* left all the Jews and Heathens uncompelled to be Chriſtians, yea and uſed them commonly in places of dignity and Government in City, Provinces and Armies, and that they continued in ſuch power under many Emperours after him, will hardly believe that in *Conſtantine*'s time *C. P.* had half or a quarter ſo many Chriſtians as were in the time of *Arcadius* and *Chryſoſtom*; And yet then *Chryſoſtom* conjectureth the Chriſtians to be an hundred thouſand, and all the City poor half as many, but the Jews and Heathens not to be numbred. See him one *Act* 4. *Hom.* 11. When he is making the moſt of their eſtate and numbers, ſaith he [*I pray you tell me: How great a number of all ſorts of men hath our City? How many Chriſtians*

will you that there be (That is will you grant, or do you think there be ?) *Will you that there be δέκα μυριάδας, an hundred thousand ? But how great is the Number of Jews and Ethnicks ? How many pounds of Gold have been gathered ?* (or Myriads ?) *And how great is the Number of the Poor ?* (that is, of the whole City ?) *I do not think they are above fifty thousand* (*Commelin.* hath put an hundred thousand, as *Erasmus* Translation, I suppose by the Errour of the Press.) Now if there was in *Chrysostom's* daies but an hundred thousand (which many say is not near so many as there be in two Parishes here, *Martins* and *Stepney*) it is not like that in *Constantine's* Time they were half so many at most. And yet I am far from thinking that there was then no more than usually met in an Assembly, or could so meet.

§ 6. The Jesuites, *Valesius* and *Sirmondus*, I am no fit person to censure. But I am not satisfied why their Credit should go as far with me as it doth with him: I have before spoke of *Valesius's* Recording *Grotius* as one that designed to bring many with him into the *Roman* Church. And *Grotius* himself saith, That many of the *English* Bishops were of his mind, as Bishop *Bromhall*, and many Doctors by defending him seem to be: And yet when I wrote my *Christian Concord*, and *The Grotian Religion*, how many censured me as a Slanderer, for saying less than *Valesius* doth. Yet I am false with this Historian, and *Valesius* is a credible Jesuite.

And he vouchsafeth to tell us the Judgment of *Valesius*, that *Eusebius Nicomed.* was no *Arian*, pag. 332. where he saith [Eusebius *of* Nicomedia *was no Heretick in the Judgment of* Valesius: *But if he were, he was not an Heretick, because he did not begin the Arch-Heresie, but followed* Arius.]

What the meaning is of the latter words I know not [*If he were* (an Heretick) *he was not an Heretick*] I conjecture it is one of the *almost Infinite Errata's* of the Printer: (But he supposeth my Printer's to be mine own:) But that *Eusebius Nicomed.* should be no Heretick, whom all the stream of credible Historians make to be that Arch-Heretick (I say not the first) who corrupted *Constantine* his Court and Son, which introduced the prevalency of *Arianism* to the almost Ruine of the Orthodox Church, is a thing which he that believeth *Valesius* in, must prefer the Credit of one Jesuite that lived above a thousand years after, before the whole current of the best Historians of the same,

ſame, and many following Ages. And did I ever ſo diſcredit the whole ſtream of Church-Hiſtorians, as on the word of one Jeſuite, to bring them under the ſuſpicion of ſuch a Lie? But I confeſs I am more inclined to believe a Jeſuite, and a Prelatiſt, when they excuſe any man of Hereſie, than when they accuſe him.

§ 7. In the Preface he tells us that ["*Had I conſulted* Sirmond's "*Edition of the* French *Councils I muſt have wanted ſeveral Alle-*"*gations for the Congregational way, which are nothing elſe but corrupt* "*readings of the ancient Canons of the* Gallican *Church. Nor can we* "*ſuſpect* Sirmond *as too great a favourer of Dioceſan Biſhops, ſince it* "*is well known how he is charged by the Abbot of S.* Cyran *under the* "*name of* Petrus Aurelius, *for having falſified a Canon in the Council* "*of* Orange *to the prejudice of the Epiſcopal Order*] *Jeſuites care* "*as little for Biſhops as our Proteſtant Diſſenters can do.*] *Anſw.* I doubt not but *Sirmond* was a very Learned man, and had not the Conformiſts diveſted me of all Church-maintenance, I had been like to have bought his *French* Councils. In the mean time, that notice which others before him gave of the Acts and Canons of Councils, ſufficed to my furniture, fully to prove the Cauſe I maintained: But I confeſs his pretended reaſon no whit inducеth me to give more credit to a Jeſuite than to another man. Though *Albaſpineus* was a Biſhop, there is ſo much Judgment and Honeſty appears in his Obſervations, that I would ſooner believe him about Epiſcopacy, than a Jeſuite that you ſay is againſt it.

But it's as incredible to me, as the reſt of his ſpurious Hiſtory, that the *Jeſuites care as little for Biſhops as our Proteſtant Diſſenters can do.* Sure many of thoſe called Presbyterians and Independents, would have none at all. If this be true, then 1. The Jeſuites would have no Biſhops of *Rome*, though they be his ſworn Servants. 2. Then they would have no Biſhops to be ſubject to the Pope. 3. Then they would have all particular Churches to be without Biſhops, or to be unchurcht. 4. Then they would have Ordination without Biſhops. 5. Then they think not that an uninterrupted Succeſſion of Epiſcopal Ordination is neceſſary to Church or Miniſtry. 6. Then they think that Biſhops ſhould not confirm. 7. Then they are againſt the Councils of Biſhops, General or Provincial. 8. And againſt Dioceſans Government of the Pariſh Prieſts. And yet is a Jeſuite a Papiſt? Wonderful!

Wonderful! that they will venture their Lives in endeavours for the Church of *Rome*, and that they write so much of and for Bishops Councils, and yet are quite against them.

But if really this be so, you that take me for incredible, who am against but the Corruption of Episcopacy, do allow me to take *Sirmondus* and *Valesius*, and the rest of the Jesuites for incredible, who are as much against the very Office as our Dissenters can be? But what will not some Historians confidently say?

CHAP. XVI.

Mr. M's. Observations on my Notes of credible and incredible History, Examined.

§ 1. I. BEcause I suppose that common sound Senses are to be trusted: He 1. Infers that I was asleep, & thought that I saw all that I relate; that is, He that saith he must believe sense, implies that he seeth all that he reporteth: I am one of the unlearned, and this Logick is too hard for me: Let it be his own.

2. He concludes, *That we must not believe our senses, if they were not Presbyterians but Episcopal that begun the late War* (in *England*:) As if he had seen not only the Parliament (Lords and Commons) then, and the Army then (forty years ago almost) but had seen their Religion, or heard or read them then so profess it: Whereas I cannot learn yet whether he was then born, or of capable understanding, and hath neither sense nor reason for what he saith. The Case that we are in is very sad, when both sides say they have the Evidence of Sense it self against each other; what hope then of Reconciliation? They that are yet living, that were Lords, Commons, and Commanders, say their internal Sense and Self-knowledge told them that they were no Presbyterians, but Episcopal; and their daily converse told them, that their Companions were mostly of the same Religion and Mind. But Young Men that never conversed with them, know them all better, and that infallibly by sense it self.

§ 2.

§ 2. II. Because I say, the History of the Gospel is certainly credible; it is ground enough to say, That *All is not Gospel that I write*; as if I had said it is.

§ 3. III. Because I say, *Prophets were sure of their Revelation*, he saith. *It may be Mr. B. heard a Bene scripsisti:* As if I had pretended to be a Prophet.

§ 4. IV. I said that History is certain even by Natural Evidence, when it is the common Agreement of all men of most contrary Interests, &c. in a matter of fact and sense to all that knew it. To which he saith [*The Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is acknowledged by Catholicks, and Schismaticks, and Hereticks, men of very contrary minds, dispositions and interests; and yet this Church-History would have us believe the contrary.*

Answ. This is our credible Historian.

1. He doth not tell us in what Ages it was so acknowledged; when those who doubt of the matter of fact, doubt but some of 100, some of 150, or 200 years: Doth any doubt whether it be so now?

2. He tells us not either what Species of Bishops the question is of, nor what Species of Presbyters, nor what the Superiority was.

3. He speaks without distinction or Exception, and so must be understood to say that *this Church history would have us to believe that even President Bishops* Ejusdem Ordinis *had* de facto *no Superiority at all over Presbyters in the same Churches and of the same order with them*, which is an untruth so gross as is no Credit to our Historian. I have named both more than one ranck of Bishops whose Superiority *de Jure* I deny not: & Popes, Patriarchs, Primates, Diocesans who deposed the Bishops of single Churches, whose Superiority *de facto* I fully enough affirm, in the ages and degrees in which they did ascend.

If he say that he meant it [*Even from the Apostles time, and that of such Diocesans as have scores or hundreds of true Churches and Altars without their particular Bishops, or any Presbyters that were* Ejusdem Ordinis *with the Bishops, and were* Episcopi Gregis, *and that had such Power of the Keys over their flocks, as ours have not: or that had so many such Assemblies that were no true Churches;*] if he will be proved a Historian worthy Credit, Let him give us any proof that all men described by him agreed *de facto* that there was so long, such a superiority of such Bishops. But these men

men deride distinguishing, and banish Logick, that is Reason, from their History.

§ 5. V. The next Evidence of certainty which I mentioned, was from [*continued Existent visible Effects which prove their Causes.*] And here this undistinguishing Historian is at it again. *The Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is proved by the Laws and Customs of all Churches.* This hath the same answer, which I will not repeat. Either it falsly reporteth my denyal, or it falsly affirmeth that all Churches in all ages have left us visible Effects of the foresaid species. And I would he would help us that are ignorant therein with such History and Evidence from the begining of the Churches in *Scotland*, and in the Southern and Eastern Countreis that were without the Empire.

§ 6. VI. I said, that History is credible which speaketh consentingly against the known interest of the authors: and therefore I named few testimonies of the sins of Popes and Councils but of those that are their most Zealous Friends. To this he saith that my Characters of ancient Bishops are taken from their professed Enemies, [as my account of *Athanasius*, *Theophylus*, *Cyril*, and divers others.]

Ans. 1. My account of *Athanasius* is almost all, if not all, in his praise, and is not an enemies testimony there valid. If I mention the displeasure of *Constantine* against him it is not any Character of him, but of *Constantine* the Agent: Nor do I think *Constantine*, or *Eusebius Cæsar*: meet to be numbred with his Enemies; why did he not instance in some words of mine?

As to *Theophylus* and *Cyril*, I do not believe that he can prove that *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, and the Historians that Concur with them, were their Enemies. And if in reciting the Acts of the Councils I recite their Enemies words, so doth *Surius*, *Nicholinus*, *Binnius*, *Baronius* and all just writers of those acts. And I do not find that *Chrysostom* himself, or *Isidore Pelusiota* had any Enmity to them, nor Pope Innocent neither. Of the rest before.

§ 7. VII. The next degree of credibility that I mentioned is that which dependeth on the Veracity and fitness of the reporter. Of which I named nine things requisite.

Here he supposeth me one that is unfit; and particluarly saith [*Whether any hath railed with greater intemperance, and less provocation*] *Ans.* 1. I am not the Author of the History of the mentioned Councils or Popes or Bishops, but the Transcriber. Let me

me be as bad as you, or any of your tribe have made me, that proveth not that *Socrates, Sozomen, Theodorite, Nicephorus, &c.* or *Binnius, Baronius, &c.* have misreported what they write. If I have misreported these authors in any material point, prove it and I will soon retract it.

As for my railing, I expect that title from all such whose faults I name, and call them to repentance: He that calls men to *Repent*, calleth them sinners, and that is Railing be it never so great.

His first instanced railing is Pag. 19. [*A few turbulent Prelates Persecute good men*] He saith thus I call the present Bishops of the Church of *England*; Doth he mean *All or some?* If *All* he is an untrue Historian: He may see many named before my Apology whom I except: And if I have named two I have annexed the proof.

The next is Pag. 46. [*silencing destroying Prelates*] *Ans.* Are there none such? Were not about 2000 here silenced? Do we not continue so and impoverished almost 20 years? Have none perished in prisons or with want? Do men call out for the execution of the Law, and plead for our Silencing as a good work, and take it for railing to have it named? Doth not Conscience recoil in these men when in Pulpits, press and Conference they maintain it to be a good work, and tell the world how sinful a thing it is for rulers to suffer us out of Gaols? What, are you now ashamed of your meritorious works? Sure they are scant good if it be railing to name them. You will not say I rail, if I call you Preachers. And why do you say so, if I call you *Silencers*, if that be as good?

The next railing is Pag. 73 [*If all the proud, Contentious, ambitious, heretiating part of the Bishops, had been of this Christian mind* (to endure each other in small tollerable Differences) *What sins, Scandal and shame, what Crimes, confusion and miseries had the Christian world escaped?*] And is this railing? Hath the Christian world had no such Bishops these 1000 years? Have not whole Kingdoms been forbidden all Gods Publick worship by such, even *France* and *England* among the rest? Is it railing to tell for what little things they not only Silenced men, but burned and murdered many thousands? Were they not proud ambitious Prelates that deposed and abused *Lud. Pius*, and those that in Council decreed the digging all the dead Bishops out of their graves to be burnt as Hereticks, who were for the Em-

perours power of Inveſtitures? Do I rail if I ſay that *Greg.*7. was Proud and ambitious when he threatened the Prince of *Calaris* with the loſs of his dominions, unleſs he made his Biſhop ſhave his beard? Do not *Jewel*, and all Proteſtant writers ſay worſe than this of Papiſt Biſhops? Is there any ſuch thing as pride silencing, burning, &c. If yea, muſt it never be known, reproved, repented of and ſo forgiven to the penitent? And if yea, than how ſhall it be known without proper names? By what name ſhould I have called *Silencing* but its own and ſo of the reſt? Gods power over Conſcience is marvellous that ſin cannot endure its own name.

The next railing is the word [*Hereticating.*] And how could I have known if he had not told me that this word is railing? Did not the Biſhops take it for a great ſervice of God, and is it railing to name it? It's true I uſed one word inſtead of a Sentence for brevity, to ſignifie the Biſhops culpable over doing in proclaiming men Hereticks. He that doth not believe that they did not well, nor do not to this day in Cutting off from the Church of Chriſt all thoſe whole Countreys of Chriſtians called *Neſtorians, Jacobites, Melchites* and the *Monothelites* and many ſuch I cannot ſave him from himſelf who will own all ſuch ſin and contract the guilt of it. Hath not Biſhop *Epiphanius* made us more Hereticks than he needed? Hath not Biſhop *Philaſtrius* made many more than the Devil himſelf made? Leſt this paſs for railing once more I will name ſome of them.

1. *His* 11*th ſort of Hereticks are thoſe that kept* Eaſter-day *at a wrong time* (*as our* Brittains *and* Scots *did.*

2. *The* Millenaries *are the* 12*th (ſuch as many of the antient fathers, and our Mr.* Mede, *Dr.* Twiſs, *&c.)*

3. *The* 27*th Offered Bread and Cheeſe at the oblation.*

4. *The* 28*th put New Wine in New Veſſels in the Church.*

5. *The* 29*th Put their fingers on their mouths for Silence.*

6. *The* 30*th thought that all Prophets ended not with Chriſt.*

7. *The* 33*d went without ſhooes.*

8. *The* Novatians *are the* 34*th.*

9. *The* 41*th thought the Epiſtle to the Hebrews was not written by* Paul, *but by* Barnabas *or* Clemens? *and the Epiſtle to* Laodicea *by* Luke.

10. *The* 42*th are the Orthodox* Miletians *that Communicated with the Orthodox and ſome* Arians *too.*

11. *The*

11. *The 46th doubted of the diversity of Heavens.*

12. *The 47th being ignorant that there is another Common Earth invisible, which is the* Matrix *of all things, do think that there is no Earth but this one.*

13. *The 48th thought that water was the common matter, and was alwaies, and not made with the Earth.*

14. *The 49th Heresie denyed that the soul was made before the body, and the body after joyned to it: and believed that Gods making them Male and Female first was to be understood of the bodily Sexes: Whereas (saith he) it was the Soul that was made Male and Female, And the Soul was made the Sixth day and the body the 7th.*

15. *The 50th Heresie thought that not only Grace, but also the Soul itself, was by God breathed into man.*

6. *The 51st is* Origens *(that thought our Souls were first celestial Intellects, before incorporate (as Mr.* Glanvile *and many now.)*

17. *The 52d thought that brutes had some reason (as Mr.* Chambre.*)*

18. *The 54th thought that Earthquakes have a natural Cause.*

19. *The 55th Heresie learned of* Trismegistus *to call the Stars by the names of Living Creatures (as all Astronomers do.)*

20. *The 56th thought that there were not many languages before the confusion of* Babel.

21. *The 57th Heresie thought that the name of a* [Tongue] *proceeded first of the* Jews *or of the* Pagans.

22. *The 58th Heresie doubted of the years and time of Christ.*

23. *The 59th thought (as many Fathers) that Angels begat Giants of women before the flood.*

24. *The 61st was that Christians were after* Jews *and* Pagans.

25. *The 62d Heresie saith that* Pagans *are born naturally, but not Christians, that is, that the Soul and body of men are not daily, Created by Christ, but by Nature.*

26. *The 63d saith that the number of years from the Creation was uncertain and unknown.*

27. *The 64 thought that the names of the daies of the week (*Sunday, Monday, &c.*) were made by God first and not by* Pagans, *and were named from the Planets.*

28. *The 66th was that* Adam *and* Eve *were blind till God opened their Eyes to see their nakedness.*

29. *The 67th Heresie imputeth the Sins of Parents to their Children.*

30. *The* 68 *Hereſie was of ſome troubled about the Book called* Deuteronomy.

31. *The* 69 *thought that thoſe ſanctified in the Womb were yet conceived in ſin.*

32. *The* 70th *Hereſie thought that the World had been firſt divided by the* Greeks, Egyptians, *and* Perſians.

33. *The* 71 *thought there was a former Flood under* Deucalion *and* Pyrrha.

34. *The* 72 *ſaith that men are according to (or under) the* 12 *ſigns of the Zodiack, not knowing that thoſe* 12 *ſigns are divers Climates, and habitable Regions of the Earth.*

35. *The* 74 *Hereſie is that Chriſt deſcended into Hell to offer Repentance there to ſinners.*

36. *The* 75 *doubted of the nature of the Soul, thinking it was made of Fire,* &c. (*as many* Greek *Fathers did.*)

37. *The* 77 *is of Gods hardening* Pharaoh, (*&c. where he deſcribeth the* Dominicans.)

38. *The* 79 *is that the Pſalms were not* (*all*) *made by* David: *and it denieth the equality of the Pſalms, as if they were not all written and placed in the order that the things were done.*

39. *The* 80 *Hereſie thought that Gods words to* Cain [Thou ſhalt rule over him] *were properly to be underſtood, whereas the meaning was* [Thou ſhalt rule over thy own evil Thoughts that are in thy own free Will.]

40. *The* 81 *Hereſie did not well underſtand the reaſon of Gods Words to* Cain, *giving him Life.*

41. *The* 82 *Hereſie thought that the Stars had their fixed place in Heaven, and their courſe, not underſtanding that the Stars are every night brought out of ſome ſecret place, and ſet up for uſe, and at morning return to their ſecret place again, Angels being Preſidents and Diſpoſers of them,*) (*that is, as ſervants bring Candles into the room at night and take them out again.*)

42. *The* 83 *doubted* (*as ſome Epiſcopal Commentators*) *of the Book of* Canticles, *leſt it had a carnal Senſe.*

43. *The* 85 *Hereſie thought, that the Soul of man was naturally Gods Image before Grace.*

44. *The* 87 *Hereſie thought, that really four living Creatures mentioned in the Prophets praiſed God.*

45. *The* 88 *Hereſie thought that the Levitical Feaſts were literally to be underſtood, not knowing that it was the* 8 *Feaſts of the Church that were meant.*

46. *The*

46. *The* 90 *Hereſie preferred* Aquila's *Tranſlation before the Septuagint.*

47. *The* 91 *preferred a Tranſlation of thirty men before the Septuagint.*

48. *The* 92 *preferred another Tranſlation of ſix men before it.*

49. *Another Hereſie preferred the Tranſlation of* Theodotion *and* Symmachus *before it.*

50. *The* 94 *Hereſie preferred the Scriptures found in a Veſſel after the Captivity before it.*

51. *The* 96th *thought that* Melchizedeck *had no Father or Mother, not knowing that it's ſpoken of him as learning that which his Father and Mother never taught him*

52. *The* 97 *hold that the Prophet* Zachariah *of Faſts, is to be properly underſtood; when as it is but for the four Faſts of the Church,* viz. *for* Chriſtmas, Eaſter, Epiphany, *and* Pentecoſt.

53. *The* 98 *Hereſie holdeth, that* Solomon's *great number of Wives and Concubines, is literally to be underſtood; whereas it is meant but of diverſity of Gifts in the Church.*

54. *The* 100 *Hereſie thought that the Meaſuring Cord in* Zachary, *was to be underſtood of meaſuring* Jeruſalem *literally whereas it meant the choice of Believers.*

55. *The* 101 *Hereſie not underſtanding the Myſtical Senſe of the* Cherubim *and* Seraphim, *in* Iſaiah, *are troubled about it, and in doubt (And here he Myſtically tells you the Myſtical Senſe.)*

56. *The laſt Hereſie thought that one of the* Cherubims *came to* Iſaiah, *and with a Coal touched his Lips, and that it was an Angel or Animal with Fire; whereas it is the Two Teſtaments, and the Fire of God's Grace.*

To theſe you may add if you pleaſe the Hereſie of holding Antipodes, determined by Pope Zachary, *by the Mediation of the holy Biſhop* Boniface, *I think an* Engliſh *man. And of what peril it is for Chriſtians to eat Jayes, and Rooks, and Badgers, and Hares, and Wood horſes: And Lard muſt not be eaten before it is dryed in the Smoak, or boiled on the Fire: Or if it be eaten unboiled, it muſt not be till after* Eaſter: *And there muſt be three great Lamps ſet in a ſecret place of the Church, after the ſimilitude of the Tabernacle, which muſt be kept burning; and at Baptiſm others lighted by them.*

Reader, remember 1. That *Philaſtrius* as well as *Epiphanius*, was a Biſhop; 2. Yea and a Saint; whereas very few Biſhops

of

of all the Councils had the honour to be Sainted.

Therefore if you say that all these were not Anathematized by Councils; I answer, 1. All these are Registred as Hereticks. 2. And they held (as Mr. *Dodwell* and his Company here do) that he that communicateth with Hereticks, is to be judged a Heretick. 3. And that Hereticks are no parts of the Church.

And forget not above all the *Henrician* Heresie, which determineth not only our King, but many Papist Princes to be Hereticks, for claiming Investitures.

And now Reader, I unfeignedly hate uncharitableness, and therefore deny no good that was in such Bishops: But I must no more be indifferent between Good and Evil, than between Heaven and Hell; nor may I judge Christ a Railer, for saying to his prime Apostle, [*Get thee behind me Satan, thou art an offence unto me*,&c.] If the name of [*Hereticators*] that is, too rash pronouncing men Hereticks be railing, I will give thee no Character, censure or name of the aforesaid practice, for I can devise no name which may not be called *Railing*. But judge of it and call it what you see cause.

And again, if you say, These are not the Decrees of Councils, I answer, These are but Flea-bitings to the wounds that the Church hath received from Councils, by Anathematizing.

The next Instance of Railing in these words, which he half repeateth [*Either credible* Socrates *and others were gross Lyars, or this Patriarch and St. was a downright Knave.*] *Ans.* He himself is so far from denying this, that he makes *Socrates* and *Sozomen* not only Lyars, but Lovers of a Lie; for what they say of St. *Theophilus:* And who is it then that is the Railer? Read the Story.

The next Instance is, *p.*95. that I call Bishops the [*Firebrands of the World.*] *Ans.* The words are these [*I take them to be the Firebrands of the World, and unworthy the regard of sober men, who pretend to know mens Judgments better than themselves, and allow not mens own deliberate professions to be the notice of their Faith.*] If they will say, that you are Hereticks in heart, though your Tongue and Life profess sound Doctrine, what means hath any man to clear himself against such, and keep from their Inquisition Racks or Flames? Is this Railing?

The next Instance is the Word [*Self-conceited Bishops*] P. 98. Having mentioned the many Logical Niceties necessary to decide

cide the Queſtion between the *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, and the Orthodox, I ſaid [*Is it not pity that ſuch Queſtions ſhould be raiſed about the Perſon of Chriſt, by ſelf-conceited Biſhops, and made neceſſary to Salvation, and the World ſet on fire and divided by them?*] Reader, remember the Diviſion made by it continueth to this day, to the Separation and Condemnation of a great part of the Chriſtian World! And is the name [*ſelf-conceited*] in deſcribing the cauſe of this a railing? How much worſe railers are they that will call a Drunkard a Drunkard, or a Fornicator a Fornicator? Read the ſadder words of *Ludolphus*.

The next *railing* is [*mercileſs, furious Biſhops*, pag. 196.] *Anſ.* There is no ſuch word: When I find where it is I ſhall ſee the occaſion of it. *Italy*, *Piedmont*, *Ireland*, &c. have tried that there have been ſuch.

The laſt is pag. 183. [*The Confounders of Churches.*] *Anſ.* I thought I had merited of them by my impartiality and lenity: As after I commend the Wiſdom & peaceableneſs of Pope *Honorius*, (though a General Council even for that made him an Heretick,) ſo I here juſtly commend the Wiſdom and Peaceableneſs of Pope *Vigilius*, who adviſed the Council to *leave dead men to God* (*Theod. Mopſ. Theodorite* and *[bis]* *and not damn them when God hath judged them already, and yet not to admit any of their wrong opinions.*] I ſay [*This was the right way: If they had all dealt as wiſely and Chriſtianlike, Councils had not been the Confounders of the Churches:*] Is this railing? At laſt they forced Pope *Vigilius* to ſubſcribe to them, and it ſo confounded the Churches, that a great part of *Italy* itſelf forſook the Church of *Rome* for it, and ſet up another head againſt the Pope an 100 Years. Was not this confuſion? And muſt it not be known?

Reader, as far as I underſtand them, the Paraphraſe of theſe mens words, is [If we kindle a fire in the Church, name it not, much leſs call any to quench it: or elſe we'll ſay it's you that kindle it: ſay not you are excommunicate or ſilenced when you are, though it be by Thouſands: elſe we will prove that you are railers: If we lay you in Gaols and take all you have, do not ſay, *you hurt us*, much leſs you wrong us: take not on you to know or feel when you are hurt: elſe we will have an Action of railing againſt you.

§ 8. That which followeth I anſwered before: But after he finds a notable piece of my ignorance. The Pope inviting the King

King of *Denmark* to conquer a Province of Hereticks, I know not who they were unless they were the *Waldenses*: *Well guest*, saith Mr. *M. Waldo* was in 1160, 80 Years after. *Ans.* This will serve for men willing to be deceived. It was the *Persons* and *Religion*, and not the name that I spoke of. Doth not he know that *Rainerius* himself saith, that those Persons (called *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, and other such names) professed that their way of Religion was Apostolical, and they derived it down from *Silvesters*, that is *Constantines* time? If I did not guess well I wrong no Bishops by it: and I confessed my Ignorance that I knew not whom the Pope meant: And why did not this callent Historian tell us who they were?

§ 9. Next he hath met with my Ignorance for saying *Vienna near France*] which is in the Borders of *France*. *Ans.* 1. Is that any slander of Bishops or Councils? 2. Truly I had many a time read in Councils, that *Vienna* was in *France*, and had not forgot it, if *Ferrarius* and *Chenu* had not also told it me; And whether it was the fault of the *Printer*, or of my *Hand*, or my *Memory*, that put *near* for *in*, I leave it freely to his Judgment, for I remember it not.

And if the manner of *Binnius* naming it made me call *Ordo Prophetarum* in *Gelasius* a Book, it's no wrong to Episcopacy.

CHAP. XVII.

His Censure of my Design, and Church-Principles, considered.

§ 1. AS to this his first Chapter I have before shewed how falsly he reporteth my design. He saith he *never saw any thing which more reflecteth on Religion: Lucian* and *Julian have left nothing half so scandalous in all their Libels against Christians, as this Church-History has raked up: Here is nothing to be seen in his Book but the Avarice, Ignorance, Mistakes and furious Contentions of the Governours of the Church.*

Ans. How false that is the Reader may see in all the beginning, the two Chapters in the end, and much in the midst, which are written contrarily to obviate such false thoughts. 2. Is the ascendent sort of Prelates that were growing up to maturity till

Gregory

Gregory the Seventh's daies, the whole Church of God? Are there no other Christians? Is all that is written against the Pope and such Ascendents, written against Christianity? Did Christ speak against Christianity, when he reproved them for striving who should be greatest? or *Peter*, when he counselled them, as 1 *Pet.* 5. And *Paul* when he said, *I have no man like minded; for they all seek their own things, and not the things that are Jesus Christ's?* Or when he said, *Demas hath forsaken me*, &c? Or *John*, when he said, *Diotrephes loved to have the preheminence?* Or all those Councils of Bishops which condemned each other, far deeplier than I judge any of them?

What have I said of Fact or Canons, which *Binnius* and their other Flatterers say not? Was it not there extant to the sight of all?

And that I Recorded not all their Virtues, 1. The History of Councils saith little of them. 2. Must no man shew the hurt of Drunkenness, Gluttony, *&c.* and so of Ambition and Church-corruption, unless he will write so Voluminous a History, as to contain also all the good done by all the persons whom he blameth? I have oft said, that I wondered that instead of so greedy gathering up all the scraps of Councils, the Papists did not burn them all, as they have done many better Books which made against them.

§ 2. I was about to answer all his first Chapter, but I find it so useless a work, that I shall ease my self and the Reader of that labour. 1. He takes on him to answer a Piece of a Disputation written about 23 years ago, whereas I have lately written a Treatise of Episcopacy, with fuller proof of the same things, which he nameth, and takes on him to answer some part of it, and answers not: Till he, or some other, shew me the mistakes of that, let them talk on for me in their little Velitations.

2. Most that is considerable which he saith, is answered already in that Book: As his fiction that *Unum Altare* in *Ignatius*, signifieth not an ordinary Communion Table, *&c.* And much more out of *Ignatius*, and many more is added, which he saith nothing to.

3. I have before shewed that he goeth on false Suppositions, that I am only for a Bishop of a single Congregation, or against all, and many such; when yet he himself confesseth the con-

trary, yea derideth me for making Twelve ſorts of Biſhops, and being for ſuch as no Party is like to be pleaſed with.

4 The contradictions and miſtakes are ſo many as would tire the Reader to peruſe an anſwer to them.

And when he hath all done with the numbring of Churches, (over-paſſing the full proof of the Primitive Form of them which I gave as before) he confeſſeth that even his great eſteemed Jeſuite *Valeſius*, [*believes that the City Church was but One even in* Alexandria, *and in* Dionyſius's *time*, p. 64.

And while *p.* 65. he makes *Petavius* and *Valeſius* ſo much to differ, as to gather their contrary Opinions from the ſame words, and conſequently one of them at leaſt underſtood them not, I that profeſs my ſelf not comparable to either of them, ſpecially *Petavius*, in ſuch things, am taken for a falſifier, if I miſunderſtand a word that concerneth not the matter of the Hiſtory.

This therefore being not about Church-Hiſtory ſo much as againſt my Opinion of the Antient Government, when he hath anſwered the foreſaid Treatiſe of Epiſcopacy, if I live not, ſome one may reply, if he deal no better than in this.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of his Second Chapter.

§ 1. PAg. 78. He would have men believe that it is Diſcipline againſt real Hereſie, that I find ſo much fault with, and aſcribe all miſchief to---

Anſw. Utterly contrary to my moſt open Profeſſion: It is only making thoſe things to ſeem Hereſie that are none (either Truth, or meer difference of words, or ſmall miſtakes,) or curing Hereſies by raſh Anathema's, without neceſſary precedent means of Conviction, or by Baniſhment or Blood.

§ 2. Is this it that you defend the Church for, and we oppoſe it for? When we would have none in our Churches whom we know not, and that have not perſonally, if at Age, profeſt underſtandingly their Faith. And what is the Diſcipline that you exerciſe on Hereticks? It's enough that you know them not,

not, and so never trouble them. Your Talk and Pamphlets truly complain what swarms of Hobbists, Sadduces, Infidels, Atheists, are among us: Do they not all live in the Parishes and Dioceses? Doth the Bishop know them? Are any of them Excommunicated? I could never learn yet how to know who are Members of your Churches: Is it all that dwell in the Parishes? Then all these aforesaid, with Jews and Papists, are in it: And then why are ten parts of some Parishes suffered without *Discipline* to shun the Parish Church-Communion? Is it all that *hear* you? Then 1. Ten parts in some Parishes, and two or three, or half in others are not of your Church, and hear you not, and many Nonconformists hear you. 2. And any Infidel may hear. Bare hearing was never made a sufficient note of a Church-Member. 3. And how can you tell who all be that hear you in an uncertain crowd? 4. And why doth not your Discipline meddle with constant Non-Communicants?

3. Is it only all that Communicate with you? 1. These are yet fewer, and so the far greatest part of many or most Parishes here are let alone to be no Church members at all, when they have been long Baptized, and no censure by discipline past on them. 2. How know you your stated Communicants, when any stranger may come unquestioned? The truth is, it is Parish discipline which you will not endure. No wonder if you named it *Issachars* burden. *Bucer in script. Anglic.* and all the Nonconformists after him long strove for it in vain. It is the hated thing. Were it possible to prevail with you for this, we should have little disagreement about Church Government. But the Popes that have been the greatest enemies of it, have yet gloried in a Discipline to set up their power over Princes and Peoples, and to have their own wills, and tread down all that are against them.

§ 2. To extenuate *Anathematizing* (so very Common with Councils) he tells us P. 81. that [" *Let him be Anathema imports no more than that we declare our abhorrence of such doctrines, and will have nothing Common with those that profess them.*]

Anf. 1. We may declare our abhorrence of every known sin and Errour, in such as must not be anathematized. 2. By (nothing) I suppose you mean not [*not the same King, Countrey, Earth, Air, &c.*] but [*not the same Church, the same Christian Communion, familiarity, love, &c.*] Whether you mean [not the

same God, Christ, &c.] I know not. But do you think the Anathematizing Bishops so unreasonable, as to renounce all Christian Communion with men and not tell why ? Or to give no better Reason than [*We abhor their doctrine* :] How few Churches or men have nothing worthy to be abhorred, that is, No Errour or sin ? And must we renounce Communion with all the Christian world ? No, they were not so bad : You use them hardlier than I. They took them to be no true Christians, as wanting somewhat of that faith which is necessary to Salvation, and Essential to a Christian, and so to have made themselves no Church-Members, and therefore are to be sentenced & avoided accordingly.

And how ordinarily do they expound [*Let him be Anathema*] that is [*Cut off from Christ ?*] Not only *Hildebrand* so expounds it often, but many before him : Whereupon they commonly agree that an Anathematized Heretick is none of the Church, nor can be saved without repentance.

And indeed to renounce all Communion with Christs true members not Cut off from the Church, is a greater sin than I charge on them. Though familiarity and specially Communion may be suspended, while delay of repentance makes the Case of a sinner doubtful.

§ 3. Pag. 82. He begins himself with blaming Bishop *Victor*, " *for Endangering the Peace of the whole Church upon so light occa-* " *sion.* Valesius *is of opinion, that it was but by letters of accusation.* *Answ.* I think it could be but by Letters of Accusation, Renunciation, and perswading others to renounce them. For Bishops were not then come up to their Commanding Power over one another. But doth not Mr. *M*'s. here rail upon a Bishop, in saying the same of him that I did, if my words were Railing ? Thus you shall have him all along confessing much of that faultiness by them, which he takes the mention of by me to be so bad.

§ 4. He nameth many Councils, which he saith I pass lightly over ; then sure I say no harm of them. He thinks it is because I could not, as if he knew it were my will. And so I am never blameless.

§ 5. But he hath a notable Controversie against *Baronius*, who thought *Novatus* had been a Bishop (such Errours as *Baronius* was guilty of by Ignorance, are excusable in one so far below him in History as I am.) But I congratulate Mr. *M*'s. discovery,

discovery, that he was but a Presbyter: But all confess that he Ordained *Felicissimus* Deacon: And here is a Presbyter Ordaining: But it was irregularly! Let it be so: He saith, that he ought not to have Ordained, but with *Cyprian*, or by his permission. I grant it. But 1. If *Cyprian's* permission would serve, then it was not a work alien to a Presbyter: If a permitted Presbyter may Ordain, a Bishop's Ordination is not necessary *ad esse Officii*; and so that which is a disorder is no Nullity. 2. And it seems by *Novatus's* Act, that the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination was not universally received. And I have not yet met with any that make it more necessary *ad esse Presbyteratus quam Diaconatus.*

§ 6. Next he mentions another *Carthage* Council, where one *Victor* dead, is condemned for making a Priest Guardian of his Child, and so entangling him in worldly Affairs. And he tells you, that all that I can say against this, is the rigour of the Sentence; but he dissembleth, and takes no notice that I mention it in praise of the Bishops of those Times, who were so much against Clergy-mens medling with Secular Affairs: What odious Puritanism would this have been with us? What I cite in praise, our Historian cannot understand.

§ 7. And that you may need no Confuter of much of his Accusation of me but himself, who so oft saith, I say nothing of Bishops and Councils, but of their faults, *&c.* he here saith as followeth.

["*After this he gives a short Account of* Councils called on the "*Subject of Rebaptization of Hereticks*: *And here, to do him right,* "*he is just enough in his Remarks: The generality of the World* "*was for Rebaptizing Hereticks*: *And considering what manner* "*of men the first Hereticks were, it is probable they had Tra-* "*dition as well as Reason on their side. However, Mr.* Baxter "*endeavours fairly to excuse these Differences, and speaks of the* "*Bishops with honour and respect, allowing them to be men of emi-* "*nent Piety and Worth. Had he used the same* Candour *towards* "*others*, &c.

Answ. 1. If this be true, a great deal contradictory is untrue.

2. He greatly misreporteth the Controversie: It was not whether Hereticks should be Rebaptized, but those that were *Baptized* by *Hereticks*, and taken into their Churches. If a Heretick had been Baptized when found by a sound Minister, and

after

after turned to Hereſie, he was to be reſtored by Repentance without Rebaptizing; and I think they all agreed in this. But I imagine this was but a lapſe of his memory in Writing.

3. But the Queſtion is, Whether the Biſhops, whoſe faults I mention, were of equal Worth and Innocency with thoſe whom I honour and praiſe? Let the proof ſhew.

I would he would freely tell us, Q. 1. Whether he think at this day the generality of Biſhops (in *Italy*, *Spain*, *France*, *Germany*, *Poland*, the *Greek* Church, *Moſcovy*. *Armenia*, *Syria*, &c.) are ſo commendable, as not to be notably blamed? Q. 2. If not, When was it that he thinks they ceaſed to be generally ſo commendable? Was it in *Hildebrand*'s Time, or any time before? Q. 3. Can you believe that the generality turn from good to bad juſt in one Age? Or rather that they degenerated by degrees? If they were moſtly bad in a thouſand, or nine hundred, or eight hundred, can you think that they were not drawing towards it and near as bad a little before; Q. 4. What was it think you in which the Corruption of the Clergy did conſiſt? Was it not moſt in a proud, domineering worldly Spirit? Is it not that that you blame the Popes for? Was not their Aſcent their Corruption? Sure you all agree of that. Q. 5. And did the Papacy Spring up in a year? Did not *Leo* begin to arrogate, and others after him (to ſay nothing now of thoſe before him) riſe higher and higher by degrees as Children grow up to manhood, till in *Greg.* 7. it came to Maturity? I know no Proteſtant that denyeth this? Q. 6. And can you or any ſober man think that in ſo many hundred years it was only the Biſhop of *Rome* that was ſick of this diſeaſe, and that all or moſt of the other Biſhops were Free? Were they not commonly for aſcending with them: Did not they in the Eaſt ſtrive to be greateſt? And the Biſhops of the Weſt ſtrive to riſe with, and by the Pope? Were they not, and are they not as his Army? And did he prevail againſt the Primitive Purity and Simplicity without them? Did not his Councils, and Prelates, as his Armies, do his greateſt works? Yea, have they not oft out-done him, and over-topt him in Miſchief (as in the depoſing of *Ludov. Pius* againſt his will? ſay good Hiſtorians.)

Tell us then at what Age juſt we may begin to diſpraiſe the Biſhops. And from that time forward, will you not be as great a Railer as I, and ſcandalize Chriſtianity more than *Lucian* or *Julian*?

§ 8. But

§ 8. But I somewhat marvel that he is again at it (reciting *Dionysius*'s words which he thinks I mistook for *Eusebius*'s) *That he does not condemn the rebaptizing of Hereticks which was a Tradition of so great antiquity*: I judge more Candidly of him than he doth of me: Though he so oft repeat it, I will not believe that he knew not, that it was not the baptizing of Hereticks as such, that was the question: but only of those that were baptized by Hereticks. Yet I confess *Eusebius* phrasing it, might tempt one to think so that had not read *Cyprian* and others upon the questions. But when *Eusebius* and *Dionysius* mention [*rebaptizing Hereticks*] they mean only those that were by *Hereticks baptism entered into* the *Societies* and *Profession* of *Hereticks*. If the worst Heretick, yea or Apostate, had been baptized, by the orthodox, *Cyprian* and all the rest were agreed against Rebaptizing such when they repented. This *Dionysius* telling *Xystus Rom.* of an ancient Minister that was greatly troubled in Conscience that he had been *falsly Baptized* by an Heretick (being himself no Heretick) and doubted whether he should not be Rebaptized, yet saith, He told him he durst not Rebaptize him that had so long been in the Church and Communicated, but bid him go on Comfortably in Communion (Much like a forementioned case put to me, by some that never were Baptized, but in our undisciplined Parish Churches had been without knowledge or question admitted long to Communion, whether yet they should be Baptized at all: And *Dionysius*'s Reasons against it I cannot answer.

§ 9. And here I may take notice how our new Church-men, (such as *Thorndike*, Mr. *Dodwell* and all their partners) who nullifie sacraments delivered by one that hath not Canonical Ordination by a Bishop of uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles, do make themselves Hereticks in the sense of the Roman Church which they allow: For 1. Baptism is the first and most necessary Sacrament in their own opinion. Yea *Austin* and too many of old, but specially too many now, take it to be necessary to Salvation; 2. If therefore Baptism be a nullity all that are Baptized in *England*, *Scotland* and all the Protestant Churches by such as had no such Ordainers, must be Baptized again or be damned. 3. If they say, They may be saved without it, then 1. they confess Mr. *Dodwells* Doctrine to be false, that saith none have a Covenant right to Salvation, who have it not by a Sacra-

ment

ment from such hands. 2. And they renounce the Doctrine of the Necessity of Baptism to Salvation. But if they are for Rebaptizing all such Protestant Countries, as necessary to Salvation, they are uncharitable that do not speak it out.

§ 10. He passeth by Bishop *Stephens* Excommunicating all the Oriental Bishops of *Cappadocia*, *Cilicia*, *Galatia*, and Reprobating their Synods, for Rebaptization: Doth he think that even then some Bishops did not rise too fast?

§ 11. The man that is so angry with me for telling of the faults of Bishops and Councils, is *pag.* 87. angry with me for not saying worse against *Secundus* his Council of Bishops at *Cirta*; and saith, I have not done right to the Catholick Church: I perceive the question is not, whether I may *Rail* at Bishops, but what Bishops they be that I must Rail at.

As for the Council at *Sinuessa*, I believed the being of it no more than he doth: And when I am but naming the common Catalogue, he might pardon my modesty for saying that the being of it is a Controversie.

§ 12. Of the Council of *Illiberis* he saith but contractedly the same that I do, that *It hath many good Canons, and some that need a favourable Interpretation, and is very severe in some cases.* This measure of just praise and dispraise, is practised by him that is condemning it in me.

§ 13. As to his Controversie, whether Bishops, or such as strove to be Bishops, were the very first movers of the *Donatists* Controversie, who should be Bishop, it's not worth the turning over one Book to search, as to my business.

§ 14 Next he that accuseth me of Railing at Bishops, accuseth me for saying (from some good Authors) that a Bishop of *Carthage*, *Donatus*, was a good man, who he saith was *bad*. It's little to me whether he were good or bad.

§ 15. Next he noteth that I Err with *Binnius* and *Baronius* as to the year of a *Carthage* Council. I undertook not to justifie all the Chronology or History that I transcribe: Whether *Optatus*, or *Binnius* and *Baronius* hit on the just year, little care I.

§ 16. I praised a *Donatist*'s Council of 270 Bishops at *Carthage* for Moderation, agreeing to communicate with penitent Traditors, without Rebaptizing them, and so doing for 40 years. Q. What was these mens Heresie?

He

He saith, *This looks liker a piece of Policy than Moderation*, for it had *no tendency to peace, but to strengthen the Schism.*]

Ans. Who knows how to please men? When they exclaim against Separation if men Communicate with them, they judge it but Policy, that hath no tendency to peace. 2. And who is it now that most raileth at Bishops? I am confuted for praising the moderation of 270 of them, and he is their censurer even when they do well, and their moderation with him is but Policy. Even as they say, of me, that I constantly Communicate with their Parish Churches to undermine them: Near or far off, all's one with this sort of men, if you stick at any thing that they bid you say or do.

But he will not believe that this Council of Orthodox moderate *Donatists* were so *many* as 270. "*Because* 1. *we have only the* "*Authority for it of* Tychonius *a* Donatist. 2. *It's improbable after* "Constantine's *suppression of them that Schism should so suddenly* "*spread.* 3. *Lest it should prove the Churches to be too Small: Yet* "*he saith, These Schismaticks set up Churches in every City and* "*Village.*]

Ans. 1. It's said *Tychonius* confesseth this Council, because the later *Donatists* would fain have buryed the memory of it: But that it depends only on the Credit of *Tychonius*, I think depends only on your Credit: 2. *Augustine* that reports it, honoureth this *Tychonius*, and reciteth an Exposition of his of the Angels of the Churches, *Rev.* 2. and 3. which I suppose displeaseth you more than his Donatism. 3. It seems you would have believed some stranger that knew it not, rather than a *Donatist* that speaketh against the will and interest of his party. 4. It rather seems that the *Donatists* were the greater number of Christians there before *Constantine*'s time, and like the Papists therefore counted themselves the Catholicks and the others the Schismaticks. *Constantines* Prohibition did not suppress them. 5. Therefore the numerousness of their Bishops and smallness of Churches, rather sheweth what was the state of the Churches before worldly greatness swelled them to that disease, which was the Embrio or infancy of Popery.

§ 17. Whether the *Donatists* be like the Papists or the Separatists (much less to the Nonconformists) if the Reader will but peruse what I have said and what Mr. *M.* hath said, I am content that he judge without more words.

§ 18. He passeth by divers Councils because he could not say that I blame them: And he passeth by *Constantine*'s Epistle to *Alexander* and *Arius*, which *raileth* at them more than I do (in his sence.)

As to the Council of *Laodicea*, it is not two or three such words as his that will make an impartial man believe that the Churches were like our *Dioceſſes*, when every Convert before baptism was to say his Catechism to the Bishops or his Presbyters: Or that the Command that Presbyters go still with the Bishop into the Church, and not before him, do not both imply that they were both together in every Church.

But he will have it confined to the Cathedral; And when I say, There were long no Churches but Cathedrals, he saith he *will not* differ with me whether they shall be called *Churches* or *Chappels*. But the difference is *de re*: They say themselves that A Bishop and a Church were then Relatives: And when they have put down many hundred Churches under the *Dioceſan*, forsooth they will gratifie us by giving us leave to call them Churches. As if they put down an hundred to one of the Cities and Corporations, and then give us leave, to call them Corporations when they are none. Yet blush they not to make the world believe that they are that Episcopal party (who put down a thousand Churches and Bishops in some one *Dioceſs*) and I am against Bishops.

Yea when they have not the front to deny but that every City then had a Bishop (that had Christians,) and that our Corporations are such as they called Cities, Yet when we plead but at least, if they will have no *Chorepiſcopi*, they will restore a Church and Bishop with his Presbyters to every such City with its adjacent Villages, hatred, scorn and derision goeth for a Confutation of us; Though we do it but to make true discipline a possible thing; Which they call *Issachar*'s burden, and abhor it, and then say, It is possible and practised.

§ 19. As to the *Roman* Council which he believeth not, he might perceive that I believed at least their antiquity as little as he: But the Canons are so like those of following Councils that such it's like were sometime made.

And whereas I noted that their condemning them that wrong timed Easter, would fall on the Subscribers to our *English* Liturgy, where 2000 are Silenced for not Subscribing, the man had

had no better answers to give, than these 1. That *I should have said the Almanack-Makers.* As if he would have had men believe that Falshood, that it was the Almanack Makers and not our Liturgy changers that were deceived.

2. [*Alas! one year they mistook.*] As if he would Perswade men that their rule faileth but one year, which faileth oft.

3. *The Silenced Ministers have little Reason to thank him or any body else, that giveth this Reason of their Separation. It's strange this should trouble their Consciences that Care no more for* Easter *than for* Christmas, *but only that it Falls upon a Sunday.*

Here see his Historical Credibility. 1. Would he perswade men that we give this *Reason alone*? Or why may it not be one with twenty more?

2. He intimateth that I give them as reasons of *Separation*: As if to be *Silenced*, were to *separate*, and to be *passive* were to be *active.*

3. He intimateth that as Nonsubscribers I and such other are Separatists, which is false; While we live in their Communion.

4. He taketh on him to know our judgment as against *Easter* (but for *Sunday*) when we never told him any such thing.

5. He intimateth that it's no credit to us that we make Conscience of deliberate professing. *Assent* to a known untruth in open matter of fact: And if the Contrary be their Credit, I wish they may never be Witnesses against us.

6. He intimateth that a man that is not for keeping *Easter*, is the less excusable, if he will not Profess a known Falshood about the time of *Easter.* If Conscience stood a man in no stead for greater Ends than worldly wealth and ease and honour, who would not be a Latitudinarian Conformist?

§ 20. Next when I deny belief to these Councils, he blames me for making advantage of the History of them. As if he saw not that I do it, but *ad hominem* to the Papists who record them as if they were really true. For it is principally the Papists (from Infancy to *Hildebrands* Maturity) against whom I write.

§ 21. He next comes to the *Novatians as my Favourite sect*, And [*Favourite*] may signifie to the Reader a truth or a *Falshood.* 1. Doth not every Christian Favour them that have lesser Errours more than them that have greater?

2. Do I not as oft as he professes my great dislike of every sect, as a sect?

3. Do I not disclaim this Novatian sect and their opinion, and own the Contrary?

4. It seems he taketh me to be too Favourable to some Bishops and their followers: The question is but who they be that must be favoured? I may come to be taken for a Novatian by such men as well as *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.

§ 22 Here (without railing) he bedawbs *Novatus* and *Novatian* to the purpose with *horrid Crimes*, a *Pharisaical Saint*, *Perjured*, and what not? But what! Were they not Episcopal? Yes, he doubts it not: It was for to be a Bishop that *Novatian* wrought his Villanies; (what if I had thus bedawbed the Episcopal?) But yet the very word [*Puritan*] is of use to him. *This*, saith he of *Novatus*, *was the tender Conscience of the author of the Ancient sect of the Puritanes?* Can you tell who the man aimeth at? Is it Nonconformists? *Novatus* & *Novatian* were Prelatists, and never scrupled more Ceremonies than our Prelates impose. Who then can it be but men that in general, though Episcopal, do profess *Tenderness* of *Conscience*? And there I leave them, without the application.

§ 23. But this Defender of Surgent Prelacy, sticks not to disgrace those whom he seemeth to defend. It was three of the Catholick Bishops that Consecrated *Novatian*, and (without railing) he calls them *Three plain ignorant Bishops. These good men suspecting no trick, and overcome with his good entertainment, with too much Wine and perswasions, were forced at last to lay their hands on him and Consecrate him Bishop.*] 1. *Ignorant Bishops*; 2. *Overcome with too much Wine*, and entertainment: 3. And with perswasion: 4. To do such an Act as to Consecrate so bad a Bishop, & that in such a city as *Rome*, and that without the Churches choice or Consent. How much worse have I said of Bishops? But, yet [*they were good men.*] But if they had been Nonconformists, what names had been bad enough for them? No doubt if they had been sequestred and cast out (for their too much wine and such ordination) how odiously might the agents have been described as enemies to the Church and Persecutors of *good men*.

§ 24. Yet further this New Bishop *engageth men to him by Oaths, enough to strike a horror in the minds of the* Reader, saith he. See what a man may do for a Bishoprick? It reminds me of many good Canons that forbid Bishops swearing their Clergy to them: And of our *Et Cætera* Oath in 1640 never to Consent to

any

any alteration, (to say nothing of our times) and the old Oath of Canonical obedience. It strikes *horror* into mens minds now that we scruple these.

§ 25. He maketh the Novatian doctrine *blasphemous* (without railing) and me too Favourable in representing it. As to that I suppose he is not ignorant how great a Controversie it is what they held, even among the greatest Antiquaries, and Enemies of Schism and Heresie. And I use in accusations to meet with most truth in the most Favourable interpretations.

And here I will tell our Historian, that while I take leave to dissent from his accusation, it shall be but by the authority of those whom I judge as well acquainted with Church Writers and Customes as any that ever Mr. *M.* or any of his Masters read, not excepting more knowing men than *Valesius*.

The first is D. *Petavius* in *Epiphan. de Cath.* Where first he tells us, that no less nor later men than *most of the ancient Fathers*, and *Specially* the *Greeks*, mistook *Novatus* and *Novatian* for one, or thought the sect had a single Author; naming *Euseb. Theodoret, Epiphan. Nazian. Ambrose, Austin, Philastrius*, yea and *Socrates*. Yet half as great a mistake in me would have been scorned.

2. Against *Epiph.* and *Theodoret* he saith [*Non ea Novatiani Opinio fuit, eos qui gravioris peccati noxam contraherent, ab omni spe consequendæ salutis excludi: Nam & illos ad capessendam pœnitentiam hortari solebant: Et ut Divinam clementiam lachrymis ac sordibus elicerent identidem admonebant: Sed hoc unum negabant; ad Ecclesiæ fidelium Communionem recipi amplius oportere: Neque penes Ecclesiam reconciliandi jus ullum ac potestatem esse: Quippe unicam illam peccatorum indulgentiam in illius arbitrio versari, quæ per Baptismum obtinetur*; which he proveth out of *Socrates, Ambrose*. And he saith, that they were not counted Hereticks for wronging the lapsed, by denying them Communion, but for wronging the Church Power, by denying the Power of the Keyes for their Restitution. (Like enough.)

The other shall be that excellent Bishop *Albaspineus Observ. lib. 2. Observ. 20, 21. p. (mihi)* 130, 131. [*Advertant Novatianorum errorem non in eo positum, quod dicerent neque lapsum, neque excommunicatum in morte à peccatis liberandum; sed hæreticos ideo habitos, quod opinarentur Deum ipsum Ecclesiæ neque remittendorum neque retinendorum peccatorum capitalium potestatem*

copiamque

copiamque feciſſe: Atque hæc in eo fuit vigiitque eorum hæreſis, qui quanquam illud conſequeretur ex eorum falſa Opinione, ut abſolutionem non largirentur, tamen hoc eorum factum non hæreſis nomine afficiendum erat, neque ad hæreſin accedebat ob aliam causam quam quod à fonte illo & quaſi capite hæreſin olente dimanârat, eo maxime quod Novatiani crederent id Eccleſiæ a Deo non fuiſſe præſtitum & conceſſum; quæ cauſa ſola fuit cur praxis illa ceu diſciplinæ Novatianorum ratio hæreſis nomen notionemque non effugeret.]

The Clergy felt their own Intereſt, and the *Novatians* denied their Power to retain, as well as *forgive* capital Crimes, and thought their Keyes extended not ſo far.

And that the Caſe of the lapſed was it that they began with, *Epiphanius* himſelf and others agree.

And *Obſerv.* 19. he ſhews that *Novatianus* did this againſt his former Judgment, in Envy and Faction againſt the Biſhop, becauſe he miſt of being Biſhop himſelf. A Biſhoprick was it that provoked him to deny this Pardoning Power in Biſhops.

And *Albaſpineus* hath in many antecedent Obſervations ſhewed, how little, if any thing at all, the *Novatians* differed elſe from the Antient Church in the ſtrictneſs of their Communion, and avoiding ſinners: So that he thus begins his fifth Obſervation [*Incredibilia prope ſunt, quæ his capitibus dicturi ſumus: ſed tamen ita vera & certa, & quæ cujuſque animam ſummam in admirationem rapiant, Eccleſiam primis temporibus nulla vel leviſſima labe inquinatam fuiſſe; quin ita illibatam intactamque ut omni ratione, curâ & ſolicitudine proſpexerit, filii ut ſui quam à Baptiſmo hauſerant puritatem eam nulla aſperſam vitii alicujus macula & fœditate conſervarent. Imo ea ſe veritate adhibita ut fugiendum ſibi deteſtandumque peccatum, quovis terrore propoſito putarent. Non ſolum autem multa crimina peccataque numerabantur, quorum Authores artificeſque abſolutionem omnem deſperabant, ſed & ea quoque quibus ignoſcet pœnitentiam concedi oportere cenſuerat, peccata ita ulciſcebatur, ut non niſi ſemel eis qui ea commiſiſſent, unius pœnitentiæ copiam faceret Eccleſia, hoc eſt ſi poſt Baptiſmum lethaliter peccaſſent. Quod ſi cum Eccleſia reconciliatus in idem aut aliud mortale peccatum iterum prolaberetur, ita in perpetuum tribus primis ſæculis ab Eccleſia repulſam ferebat, ut non niſi pœnitentiæ & in morte precum quæ reliqua erant ſubſidia expectanda ſibi duceret, nulla abſolutione data quæ in ſpem veniæ illum erigeret.*] And he adds, that many that cannot deny his proofs,

proofs, yet will not believe that ever such a Discipline was used.

But this was in the three First Ages: After, when Prosperity and Wealth riced the ungodly into Bishops Seats, and into the Church, the Case was altered, and as he shews, *Observ.* 6. the Case was so altered to the loose extreme, that Criminals were admitted *toties quoties*. And in his Notes on *Tertullian* he sheweth, that this was a difference between the Orthodox and the Hereticks, that the Orthodox did *diu multumque deliberare quos in societatem ejusdem Ecclesiæ, & corporis recipere debeant*; but the Hereticks were ready to take all that came. Yet I suppose not near so loose as those Diocesan and Parochial Churches that know not who comes, but without question take all that will but come to the Rails and kneel: And when by the magnitude of Dioceses and other means, they have secured themselves against the trouble and possibility of Pastoral Discipline, the Priest wipes off all guilt with a word, and saith, If they were Atheists, Hobbists, Sadduces, Whoremongers, common Blasphemers, Drunkards, it's no fault of mine, I know it not; and no wonder, when he knoweth not who in the Parish are his Flock.

That *Eusebius* himself and others named by *Petavius* mistook the Novatians is no wonder to those who read the volumes of palpable Falshood written against the Nonconformists in this present age, and hear witnesses at the bar swear those Plots and Conspiracies & Treasons against men, from which grave and conscionable Juries quit them.

But me thinks when Mr. *M.* had said that *Socrates is an Historian of good Credit and acquainted with them*] he much forgot his own ends when he recited these words as his [*Some took part with* Novatian, *and others with* Cornelius; *according to their several inclinations and Course of life: The looser and more licentious sort Favouring the most indulgent discipline, the other of more austere lives inclining most to the Novatian severity.*] Good still, I now see that the Novatians indeed were Puritanes, though Episcopal, and I accuse not our accusers of any such Heresie. But I confess that I shall believe a Novatian Historian, who being so strict against sin must be strict against a Lie, rather than those that Scorn such Puritanism, and deride the Person that cannot swallow a bigger Pill.

And when Mr. *M.* labours to shew out of *Socrates* that it was

was not only Idolatry that they cenſured, he labours in vain: It was the *beginning* of their Schiſm that I mentioned, and not *Socrates* his Age.

As to the judgment of the Council of *Eliberis* and all the three Firſt Ages, I have told you what *Albaſpine* ſaith before. If you can confute him, do; I am not engaged to defend him; but I believe him.

§ 26. I conclude this and the former Chapter with this Counſel to the Scorners of Puritanes: Never truſt to your Titles and Order, how good ſoever, without a careful holy obedience to the Supreme Law-giver, either for Concord on Earth, or Salvation in Heaven. True Pariſh-Reformation is the way to ſatisfie godly perſons better than either Violence or Separation. But if you ſtill obſtinately reſiſt Pariſh-Diſcipline and Reformation, you muſt have Toleration of ſuch as will not conſent to your Corruption, or elſe perſecute the beſt to your own ruine. *Theophilus Parochialis* hath ſaid more for Pariſh Order againſt the Regulars, and Priviledged, than you have done againſt the Separatiſts. And yet the Confraternity of the *Oratorians* ſet up in every Pariſh, was the beſt way he could deviſe to recover the ſtate of lapſed Pariſhes: As the priviledging of Fryars was the Pope's laſt Remedy inſtead of Reforming his corrupted Church.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Council of Nice *and ſome following.*

§ 1. THis Hiſtorian having put himſelf into a military poſture ſeemeth to conceit that every word proceeds from an Enemy. And firſt he feigneth me to make *Conſtantine* judge that [*the Biſhops and Councils were of little uſe*] when I had no ſuch *word or thought*, but the contrary.

§ 2. Next he himſelf confeſſeth that which I blame thoſe Biſhops for; Even thoſe Libels which they Contentiouſly offered againſt one another; to have raiſed Quarrels inſtead of Peace, and which *Conſtantine* caſt altogether into the fire without reading them. And when he confeſſeth what I ſay, is he not a Railer at the Biſhops as much as I in that?

As

As to his excuse that [*It is no wonder considering their great dissentions in Religion, &c.*] I easily grant it: But in this excuse he saith yet more against them.

§ 3. Because I said that *Athanasius* differing from *Constantine* about the reception of *Arius* his repentance [*Caused much Calamity*] he feigneth me heinously to accuse *Athanasius* which I intended not: Even a just action may [*Cause Calamity*] as Christ saith his Gospel would bring division. All his labour in justifying *Athanasius* fighteth but with a spectre of his own imagination. And yet I am inclined to think that if an Hypocrite *Arius* had been connived at to please such an Emperor, the death of *Arius* would have left the Church quieter than it did; though he here thinks greater rigour had been safer: And I think multitudes of Sadduces, Infidels and debaucht Persons in one of our Dioceses, yea or Parishes, is worse than one *Arius* while Hypocrisie restrained him from Venting his opinion.

§ 4. And here he that dreamed I accused *Athanasius*, really accuseth *Constantine* as *imposed on by a Counterfeit Repentance and restoring the incendiary to opportunities of doing mischief, and* being against the means that *might have ended that fatal mischief.* But I confess *Constantine* was no Bishop, and therefore this is not an *accusation of Bishops* or a railing at them.

§ 5. Next when I had fully opened the Case of the *Meletians* out of *Epiphanius* on pretence of abbreviating, he leaves out that which he likes not, and tells us how the Nonconformists have advantaged the Papists: If I thought the man believed himself I would try to undeceive him: In the mean time I desire him to think again which party most befriends the Papists; "They "that are for a reconciliation with them on these terms, that "there may be acknowledged an Universal supreme human "Power over all the Church on Earth, and the Pope to be *Prin-* "*cipium Unitatis* and Patriarch of the West, and he shall abate us "the last 400 years Impositions, and all be accounted Schisma- "ticks that unite not into this Church; and that all the "Preachers in *England* shall be silenced that will not swear, pro- "mise, profess, and practise all that which is here imposed on "them, though they think it heinous sin, and others think it but "matter indifferent, and all the people shall be prosecuted that "hear them; and that this Division shall rather weaken the "Kingdom, and advantage the Papists, than the Consciences

" of men, as wise and faithful as themselves shall be eased of " such Impositions, or they suffered to Preach the Gospel of " Christ: Or those that being condemned to such Silence, Pri- " sons and Ruine, had rather be delivered, though a Papist be " delivered with them, than be destroyed.] Methinks we are used by these Church-Fathers, as if they should determine that a great part of the Protestants who are most against Popery, shall be hanged, unless the Papists will beg their pardon, or cut the Rope; which if these Protestants accept, they shall be said to be the Promoters of the Papists.

§ 6. As for all his Exceptions against *Epiphanius*, they are nothing to me, who did not undertake to justifie his words, but transcribe them; nor think it worth my labour now to examine the Case of so small concernment.

§ 7. When some have blamed me for condemning the *Arians* too much, he saith, that I say somewhat very much to the disadvantage of the Doctrine of the Trinity, but he was so gentle as not to tell what it was, unless it be telling what *Petavius* the Jesuite saith: About that I am wholly of his own mind. But the expres's words which *Petavius de Trinit.* citeth out of all those Old Fathers, cannot be denied: And verily they are so many, and so gross, that unless his Argument satisfied me, *viz.* [*The Votes of the Council of* Nice *shewed what was the Common sence of the Church, better than the words of all those Fathers*] I should think as *Philostorgius* in point of History, that there were no sufficient confuting of the *Arians* from those Fathers, though sometimes they have better words. Visible words cannot be denied, even where they must be lamented. That's the difference between Mr. *M's.* Opinion of History and mine.

§ 8. As to the *Audians*, I recite but *Epiphanius*'s words, who in other cases is greatly valued by these Accusers: They will believe what he saith of *Aerius*. And as to what he saith to the contrary out of *Theodoret*, he may see that he saith all by hearsay, and saith, that *They hid* that which he accuseth them of, and were Hypocrites, professing too much strictness, *l.* 4. *c.* 9. which is still the common way of accusing the best, against whom instead of proveable faults, they turn their strictness into a crime. *Epiphanius* is much more particular than *Theodoret* in the story.

§ 9. The rest which he noteth of my words of the Council of

of *Nice*, have nothing needing a reply. *Petavius* hath fully proved that the *Chorepiſcopi* were true Biſhops. But now we are odious Presbyterians if we would but have a Biſhop in every City, that is, Corporation, Deſiring only that Diſcipline might become poſſible. And for this we are proclaimed to be againſt Biſhops; that is, ſaith this ſort of men; They that would have but One Biſhop over a thouſand, or many hundred, or ſcore Churches, are for Epiſcopacy; and they that would have every Church have a Biſhop, as of old, or at leaſt every great Town, and ſo would have twenty, or forty, or a hundred for one, are againſt Epiſcopacy: And that which is ſtrange is, Theſe men are believed.

§ 10. I praiſed the Council of *Gangra* for condemning ſome Superſtitions, and he ſaith, I have nothing againſt it: Whether it be a *Common Miſtake* that *Arius* was here received to Communion, I'le not ſtay to examine.

§ 11. When he hath weighed all he can for the Synod at *Antioch*, he is forced to confeſs that they were a packt company of Biſhops, that complied with *Conſtantius* and *Euſebius*'s Contrivance. And what do I ſay worſe of them than he? As to the Canon againſt Prieſts or Deacons not gathering Aſſemblies againſt the Biſhops will, I am for it as much as he, if the Biſhops and Churches be ſuch as they were then; but not in *France* nor *Italy*.

He ſaith, *I leave my ſting behind me, and end very angrily*; for theſe only words [*This is their ſtrength*] mentioning the Councils (that was againſt *Athanaſius*) ſuppreſſing Diſſenters as ſeditious by force. I ſee angry men think others angry when they are, and are ſtung if we do but name their ſtinging us: As if Priſons and Ruine were not ſo ſharp a ſting as theſe four words. If it be not their ſtrength, why do they ſo truſt to it, as to confeſs that their Arguments and Keyes would do little to uphold their Prelacy without it. In the daies of the Uſurpers I moved for a Petition, that when they granted Liberty of Conſcience for ſo many others, they would grant Liberty for the full exerciſe of the Epiſcopal Government to all that deſired it. But the Epiſcopal Party that I ſpake to, would not endure it, as knowing what bare Liberty would be to their Cauſe, unleſs they could have the Sword to ſuppreſs thoſe that yield not to their Reaſons.

§ 12. Next he ſaith, I ſpare my Gall for about a dozen

times, not regarding how it contradicts his former Accusations.

But whereas I recite the horrid Accusations of the Council at *Philippopolis* against *Athanasius*, *Paulus* and *Marcellus*, of open Matters of Fact, as Murder, Persecutions, Burning of Churches, Wars, Flames, Dragging Priests to the Market-place with Christs Body tyed about their necks, stripping Consecrated Virgins naked before a concourse of People [and offering to send messengers on both sides to Try the Fact, and to be themselves condemned if it prove not true] he is offended that I seem *staggered* at this, *Athanasius* having detected before so many Subornations, *&c.*

Answ. I did not say that I was staggered, much less doubted which of them did the wrong: But that a Reader may by such a Temptation be astonished, and confounded whom to believe. But did I ever rail more at Bishops than he here doth? What 1. So great a number of Bishops, 2. Deliberately in Council, 3. To affirm so vehemently, 4 Such matters of open Fact, 5. And offer it to the Trial of Witnesses of both sides; and all this to be false, 6. And to be but the consequent of former Subornations and Perjury; can you name greater wickedness?

Obj. But they were *Arians*. *Answ.* But they were Bishops. The worse for being *Arians*. 2. Yet called but *Semi-Arians*, and renounced *Arius*, and pretended Reconciliation. 3. And they were the Oriental part of the Council at *Sardica*, called *General* by the Papists. 4. And they were believed against *Marcellus* by *Basil* and *Chrysostom*: But all that I cite it for, is to tell the Reader what a doleful case the Church was faln into, by the depravation of the Bishops. Did none of these profess before to be Orthodox? I do not say that it was *quatenus* Bishops that they did all this, but that multitudes of Bishops were then become the shame and calamity of the Church.

§ 13. Next he scorningly accuseth me for giving too soft a Character of the *Circumcellians*; and saith, *My Moderation and Charity may extend to* John *of* Leyden. And he calls them *The Most barbarous and desperate Villains that ever defamed Christianity by assuming the Title.*]

Anf. 1. This is the man that saith I rail. I named so many and great sins of theirs, that I little thought any Reader would have thought that I spared them too much. 2. Yet they were *Donatists*, and of them *Optatus* himself saith, *lib.* 5. [" *Apud vos*

" *&*

"& *apud nos Una est Ecclesiastica conversatio; Communes Le-*
"*ctiones: Eadem Fides; ipsa Fidei Sacramenta, eadem myste-*
"*ria*] that is, saith *Albaspine* [*Una Ecclesiastica disciplina: Eodem modo Scripturas Explicamus: Ipsa Regula Fidei: Idem Mysterium quod confertur & significatur, & eadem res visibilis per quam res spiritualis datur*] in *lib.* 5. *p.* 153.

And saith *Optatus*, *lib.* 1. [*Nequis dicat me inconsiderate eos fratres appellare, qui tales sunt. Quamvis & illi non negent & omnibus notum sit, quod nos odio habeant, & execrentur, & nolunt se dici fratres nostros; tamen nos recedere à timore Dei non possumus---sunt igitur sine dubio fratres quamvis non boni: Quare nemo miretur eos me appellare fratres, qui non possint non esse fratres.*

Obj. But the *Circumcellians* were worse than the rest.

Answ. They were of the same Religion, but the unruly furious part in their practice: And *Optatus* saith, Though they would rail in words [*sed unum quidem vix invenimus cum quo per literas, vel hoc modo loquatur*:] And so goes on to call *Parmenian* his Brother. And it's worth the consideration how much *Albaspine* includeth in *Fraternity*; note first, & *in Observat.*

3. And they were Orthodox fierce Prelatists, doing all this for the preheminence of their Bishops. And what if *some Prelatists now* should hurt their Brethren more than the *Circumcellians* did, must I call them therefore *the most barbarous Villains that ever defamed Christianity*. *Augustine* saith, They made a Water of some Salt or sharp thing, and cast in mens Eyes in the night in the streets: No man can think that this barbarous action was done by the most, or any, but some furious fools: They say that they would wound themselves to bring hatred on the Catholicks, as if they had done it, or drove them to it: He that knoweth what Self-love is, will believe that this was the case but of a few; and an easier wrong than some that abhor them do to their Brethren. And must we needs Rail indeed against such numbers of hurtful Prelatists? What if any rude persons of your Church should be Whoremongers, Drunkards, Blasphemers, and seek the Imprisonment of their Brethren, yea their Defamation and Blood by Perjury, should the Church be for their sakes so called, as you call them? I speak them no fairer than *Optatus* did.

§ 14. When *p.* 57. I commend the many good Canons of the *African* Councils, and the faithfulness of the Bishops, he noteth none

none of this, becauſe it proveth the untruth of his former Accuſations.

And when I name twenty five or twenty ſix more Councils of Biſhops, ſome General, and ſome leſs, which were for Arianiſm, or a compliance with them, he defendeth none of them, but excuſeth them, and ſaith, that [*they were not much to the honour of the Church: Yet the evil Edicts and Conſequences of them are rather to be charged on the* Arian *Emperour, than the Biſhops.*]

Anſw. 1. This is the ſame man that elſewhere ſo overdoes me in accuſing the *Arians*.

2. The Emperour was Erroneous, but ſaid to be otherwiſe very commendable. And is it not more culpable for Biſhops to Err in the Myſteries of *Divinity*, than a Lay-man? And for many hundred to Err, than for *One Man?* And do you think that the Biſhops Erring did not more to ſeduce the Flocks, than the Emperour's?

But he ſaith, that [*If many fell in the Day of Tryal, they are rather, to be pitied, than inſulted over, for we have all the ſame infirmities*, &c.

Anſw. I wrote in pity of them and the Church, without any inſulting purpoſe. If any now to avoid lying in Priſon, and ſtarving their Families, by Famine, ſhould ſurrender their Conſciences to ſinful Subſcriptions after a Siege of Nineteen years, I ſhall pity them, and not inſult over them. Nay, if I ſpeak of thoſe that lay the Siege, and call out for more Execution, I do it not inſultingly, but with a grieved heart for the Church and them.

But when I largely recited *Hillary*'s words of them, he ſaith, [*The Account is very ſad*] (and what ſaid I more?) *But*, ſaith he, *yet ſuch as ſhews rather the Calamity, than the Fault of the Biſhops.*]

Anſw. Nay then, no doubt, it's no fault to Conform. *Hillary* then, and all that kept their ground, were in a great fault for ſo heavily accuſing them. And ſo the World turned *Arians* in ſhew (as *Hierom* and *Hillary* ſpeak) is much acquit, and the Nonconformiſts are the faulty Railers for accuſing them. It had been enough to ſay, *It was no Crime*; but to ſay, *no Fault*, is too gentle for the ſame man that ſo talkt of Perjured *Arians* before.

§ 15. Yet becauſe he is forced to confeſs that it was *moſt by far* of all the Biſhops, even in *Councils* (he of *Rome* not excepted)

cepted) that thus fell, he must shew how it offended him to be forced to it, by telling the world how contentious *I have been against all sorts and Sects* (the first is false, and he knows it I think, and the latter is true formally of a *Sect as such*; even his *own Sect.)* And *some judge me such a stranger to Peace, as to need a Moderator to stand between me and the Contradictions of my own Books.*]

Answ. Yes, the Bishops Advocate *Roger L'Estrange*, where nothing but gross ignorance, or malice, or negligence, could have found Contradictions, were the whole places perused. And where I am sure my self, that there is none; I have somewhat else to do than to write more, to shew the Calumnies of such Readers. Who most seeks Peace, you, or those that you prosecute? One would think it should not be hard to know if men be willing.

CHAP. XX.

Of the first General Council at Constantinople. His *Cap.* 4.

§ 1. HE begins with accusing me of imitating the Devil; Doth *Job serve God for nought*? because I say that [*the reason why the West was freer from the* Arian *Heresie, than the East, was not as the Papists say, that Christ prayed for* Peter, *that his Faith might not fail, but because the Emperours in the West were Orthodox, and those in the East* Arians: And the Bishops much followed the Emperour's will.]

What, saith he, *can be more unchristian?*

Answ. 1. I never said that this was the *Only Cause.*

2. I proved that this Priviledge of *Rome* was not the meaning of Christ's Prayer.

3. Is not this the same man that even now laid the fall of far more Bishops, even most in the World, on the Emperour, as overcoming them by force and fraud?

4. Doth not God himself keep men usually from strong temptations, when he will deliver them from sin?

5. Were not the Eastern Bishops, and the Western, of the same mold and temper? And if the Eastern followed the Emperours,

rours, had not the Weſtern been in danger if they had the like temptation?

6. Doth not *Baſil* that ſent to them for help, complain of them as proud, and no better than their Brethren?

7. Did not *Marcellinus* fall to Idolatry, and *Liberius* to ſubſcribe againſt *Athanaſius* with the *Arians*?

8. Did not the Weſt actually fall to Arianiſm when tempted for the moſt part? Judge by the great Council at *Milane*, and by *Hillary*'s complaints.

9. Hath *Rome* and the Weſt ſtood faſter to the Truth ſince then? What! all the Popes who are by Councils charged with Hereſie or Infidelity, and all wickedneſs, and thoſe many whoſe Lives even by *Baronius* and *Genebrard*, are ſo odiouſly deſcribed? Is the Weſt at this day free from Popery and its fruits?

10. Do you think in your conſcience that if we had not here a Proteſtant King, but a Papiſt, many of the Clergy would not be Papiſts? Why then are they ſo in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Poland*, &c? And why did the moſt of them turn in Qu. *Mary*'s daies? I do not inſult, but lament the Churches Caſe, which ever ſince Wealth and Honour, and too much Power corrupted it, have had Biſhops far more worldly, and leſs faithful than they were the firſt three hundred years. Though I ſtill ſay that ever ſince, God hath in all times raiſed ſome ſerious Believers that have kept up ſerious Piety in the Church: And as I doubt not but there are ſo many ſuch among the Conformiſts, as is our great Joy, ſo I hope that, though foully blotted with Superſtition and Errour, there are many ſuch among the Papiſts themſelves.

§ 2. Yet he ſaith, *I do the Biſhops Right again, without thinking of doing them Juſtice, while I tell how many were murdered.*

Anſw. 1. Doth he know my thoughts? 2. It's true I intended not to do any other Juſtice, than to praiſe Chriſt's Martyrs and Confeſſors, while I lament the Caſe of Perſecutors and Revolters? Is the praiſe of Confeſſors any honour to the Hereticks?

But perhaps he means, I right the Order of Biſhops. *Anſw.* Did I ever ſay or think that there were no Biſhops that kept the Faith? Do I ſay All fell, when I ſay Moſt fell? The Man ſpeaks as his imagined Intereſt leads him, and ſo interpreteth my words to his own ſenſe, not as written. And if that be the

right

right way, I think he will grant that there were more Martyrs and Sufferers under *Valens*, *Constantius*, *Hunnericus*, and *Genſericus*, in the Eaſt, and in *Africk*, by far, than were when their Tryal came in all the Weſt that is now ſubject to the Pope. And what moved the man to dream that when I ſo deſcribe and praiſe their conſtancy in Suffering, I did it as at unawares ?

That the greater part of the Biſhops of the Empire were *Arians*, I will not offer by Teſtimony to prove, when it is ſo commonly by Fathers, Hiſtorians, by Papiſts and Proteſtants agreed on. How many of them were Biſhops before, and how many but Presbyters or Deacons, I'le not pretend to number. The turning of multitudes all agree on. The Conſtancy of many he falſly intimateth that I deny, and ſaith, *I injuriouſly repreſent them*, and cannot tell a word wherein that Crime is found.

§ 3. Naming the things that were done by the Council at *Conſtantinople*, I mention both the ſetting up, and after the putting down of *Gregory*; & leſt any Caviller ſhould carp at the word [*putting down*] I preſently open particularly what it was that they did toward it; that reſolving on his depoſition, they cauſed him, though unwilling, rather to give it up, than ſtay till they caſt him out. This great Hiſtorian had no more manlike an Exception here, than to ſay, that againſt all Hiſtory, and againſt my own Explication, I ſay that [*They Depoſed him.*] I ſaid [*They put him down*] in the manner, and as far as I explained.

§ 4. While he here himſelf accuſeth the *Times* then of *General Corruption*, and the *Church* of *Diviſions*, adding, [*What Age hath been ſo happy as not to labour under thoſe Evils?*] he accuſeth me of making miſuſe of *Gregory*'s words, to repreſent the Council in an odious manner.

Anſw. It is to repreſent the worſer part in a lamentable manner, as far as *Gregory* did, and no further. And as to his quarrel at my citation, I ſhall ſay no more; but if the Reader will but read *Gregory*'s own words, I willingly leave all that Cauſe to his Judgment: If he will not, my words cannot inform him.

Yet he himſelf ſaith [*He doth indeed in ſeveral places find fault with this Council*] And can you forgive him? I think I find no more than he did. But for this *you* find fault *with him* [*He did reſent the Injury* (And was it an *Injury?*) *and did not bear the deprivation of his Biſhoprick with the ſame generoſity he propoſed, which made him a little more ſharp than was decent in his repre-*

sentation of the Bishops---What wonder if sharpened with discontent, he exclaim with somewhat too great a passion against the administration of the Church which he had been forced to quit] *Anſ.* All will be confeſt *anon*, when I have been accuſed for ſaying it before him: That's his way. But it was not for leaving a high and fat Biſhoprick that he was grieved, but for being ſeparated from the People that he had partly ſerved in their lower ſtate, and partly won from Hereſie, and who came about him with tears intreating him not to forſake them. And though it were more than *generoſity* to ſet light by the Honour and Wealth, it is treachery to ſet light by Souls: And they changed to their great loſs. He reſigned much to quiet the People leſt they ſhould do as they did for *Chryſoſtom* after him. It is no new thing for the Major vote of the Clergy to Envy thoſe few that are better and more eſteemed than themſelves, nor yet for the Godly People to be loth to leave ſuch paſtors.

§ 5. He ſaith [*His cenſure of Councils that he knew none of them that have any happy End, was not the fault of the expedient, but of the men*] *Anſ.* And what did I ever ſay more. It is his cuſtom when he hath ſtormed at me, to ſay in Effect the ſame that he ſtormed at. Some Papiſts would perſuade men, that it was only *Arian* Councils that he meant, but moſt Proteſtants that Write about Councils againſt them, do cite & vindicate theſe words of *Gregory*: And the impartial Papiſts confeſs that it was the Councils alſo of the Catholicks that there and elſe where he ſpake of.

§ 6. In the Caſe of *Meletius*, and *Paulinus*, two Biſhops in a City, and the Caſe of *Lucifer Calaritanus* made a Heretick for ſeparating from lapſed *Arians*, he ſaith over the ſame that I do; that *good men cannot rightly underſtand one another, and ſo it ever hath been, and it's the Effect of humane frailty and not Epiſcopacy.* In all this I agree. But 1. If humane frailty make Biſhops ſwell in pride and ambition, and domineering, it hath far worſe Effects than in other men: 2. And Biſhops are bound to excell their flocks in Piety, humility, Selfdenyal, peaceableneſs, as well as in knowledge. If the Phyſicians of this city ſhould prove unskilful, and yet confident where they err, it is not *quatenus Phyſicians* that they are ſuch: But if it be *qui* Phyſicians that are ſuch, they may kill thouſands, while the ſame faults in all their neighbours may kill few or none. If your Intereſt made you not ſmart and angry without cauſe, you would not cavil againſt ſuch plain truth.

§ 7. About

§ 7. About the Priſcillianiſts he ſaith [*I all along obſerve this Rule, to be very favourable to all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks be they never ſo much in the wrong, and to fall on the Orthodox party and improve every miſcarriage of theirs into a mighty crime.*]

Anſ. If all along this accuſation be falſe, then all a long your Hiſtory ſerveth ſuch a uſe. But in *France, Spain, Italy*, he is favourable to Hereticks that takes not the orthodox for ſuch, or that is not for racking and burning them. And in *England* he is favourable to Schiſmaticks that taketh not the greateſt lovers of Piety and peace for ſuch, and the Church Tearers for Church-Healers: As Mr. *Dodwell* phraſeth it, they are Schiſmaticks that *ſuffer themſelves to be excommunicate* (for unſinful things in the Biſhops account, and heinous ſin in theirs; and ſo that are not ſo ripe in Knowledge, as to know all the *unſinful things* to be ſuch which may be impoſed.

§ 8. What would this enemy of railing have had me ſaid more than I did of the Priſcillianiſts? *viz.* that they were *Gnoſticks and Manichees?* Was not that bad Enough. No, I favour them ſtill? And what ſay I more of the Biſhops and the whole cauſe, than *Sulpitius Severus* the fulleſt and moſt knowing Deſcriber ſaith? Why doth he not accuſe him for the ſame deſcription? Yea and their Mr. *Ri. Hooker* who in the Preface to his *Eccl. Pol.* ſaith of *Ithacius* the like? Yea *Baronius* himſelf conſenteth? Where I ſay that to the death *Martin* ſeparated from the ſynods of theſe Biſhops (I ſaid not from all Biſhops in the world) he ſaith, he *renounced only the Communion of* Ithacius *his Party, and that others did as well as he.* Reader, it will be thy folly to take either his word or mine, what an Author ſaith, when we differ, without looking into the Book it ſelf. Read *Sulpitius Severus*; I will tranſcribe ſome words, leſt he ſay, I miſtranſlate them.

" *Priſcillianus, familia nobilis, prædives opibus, acer, inquies,*
" *facundus, multa lectione eruditus, differendi & diſputandi prom-*
" *ptiſſimus---vigilare multum, famem & ſitim ferre poterat, habendi*
" *minime cupidus, utendi parciſſimus* (Was it a crime to ſay ſo
" much good of him?) But proud of his Learning, ſet up a He-
" reſie, and two Biſhops *Inſtantius* and *Salvianus* ioyned with
" him, and made him a Biſhop---At *Caſar Auguſta* one Synod
" was gathered againſt him. The Story I before recited. Next
" a Synod at *Burdeaux* tryeth them. Saith *Sulpitius* [" *Ac mea*

" *quidem*

" *quidem ſententia eſt, mihi tam reos quam accuſatores diſplicere.*
" *Certe Ithacium nihil penſi, nihil ſancti habuiſſe definio: fuit enim*
" *audax, loquax, impudens, ſumptuoſus, ventri & gulæ plurimum*
" *impertiens. Hic ſtultitiæ eo uſque proceſſerat ut omnes etiam*
" *ſanctos viros, quibus aut ſtudium erat lectionis, aut propoſitum*
" *erat certare jejuniis, tanquam Priſcilliani ſocios aut diſcipulos in*
" *crimen arceſſeret. Auſus etiam miſer eſt ea tempeſtate Martino*
" *Epiſcopo---palam objectare hæreſis infamiam. Imperator per*
" *Magnum & Ruſum Epiſcopos depravatus à mitioribus conſiliis de-*
" *flexus*--So he tells how many were put to death--*Cæterum*
" *Priſcilliano occiſo, non ſolum non repreſſa eſt hæreſis*-- *ſed confir-*
" *mata, latius propagata eſt: Namque ſectatores ejus qui eum*
" *prius ut ſanctum honoraverant, poſtea ut Martyrem colere cœpi-*
" *runt. Ac inter noſtros perpetuum diſcordiarum bellum exarſerat,*
" *quod jam per quindecim annos fœdis diſſenſionibus agitatum,*
" *nullo modo ſopiri poterat. Et nunc cum maxime diſcordiis Epiſ-*
"*coporum turbari aut miſceri omnia cernerentur, cunctaque per eos*
" *odio aut gratia, metu, inconſtantia, invidia, factione, libidine,*
" *avaritia, arrogantia, ſomno, deſidia, eſſent depravata: Poſtremo*
" *plures adverſus paucos bene conſulentes, inſanis conſiliis & perti-*
" *nacibus ſtudiis certarent: Inter hæc Plebs Dei, & Optimus quiſ-*
" *que probro atque ludibrio habebatur.*] So ends *Sulpitius* Hiſtory.

Do you not ſee, Mr. *Morrice*, that there have been Prelates and Puritanes, even Epiſcopal Puritanes before our Times? Doth not your ſtomach riſe againſt *Sulpitius* as too Puritanical and ſevere? Is not my Language of moſt of the Biſhops ſoft in compariſon of his? Yet he was ſo early as to live in that which you now call the moſt flouriſhing Time of the Church. Sir, I hate Diſcord, and love Peace; but I never look that the Enmity between the Woman's and the Serpent's Seed, or *Cain* and *Abel*, ſhould be ended; or that the holy Title of Biſhops and Prieſts ſhould reconcile ungodly men to Saints. Sir, *England* knoweth, that though ſome factious perſons have done otherwiſe, the main Body of thoſe that your Law doth Silence, Ruine and Revile, have a high eſteem of ſuch Biſhops as have been ſeriouſly godly; ſuch as were many in Antient and late Times: And deride it as long as you will, the ſeriouſly religious People in *England* are they that are moſt againſt Church-Tyranny, and which Party moſt of the debauched and prophane are of, hath long been known.

§ 9. But

§ 9. But the Reader shall further hear how little you are to be trusted. Saith *Sul. in Vita Mart.* [*Apud Nemausum Episcoporum Synodus habebatur ad quam quidem ire neluerat*---(There's another Synod.)

Et pag. 584. In *Mon. Pat.* [" *Maximus Imperator alias vir* " *bonus, depravatus consiliis Sacerdotum, post Priscilliani necem* " *Ithacium Episcopum Priscilliani accusatorem cæteroſq; illius socios,* " *quos nominare non est necesse vi regia tuebatur.*---*Congregati apud* " *Treveros Episcopi* (there's another Synod) *tenebantur, qui quotidie* " *communicantes Ithacio communem sibi causam fecerant: His ubi* " *nunciatum est inopinantibus, adesse Martinum, totis animis la-* " *befacti, mussitare & trepidare cœperunt.*---*Nec dubium erat quin* " *Sanctorum etiam maximam turbam tempestas ista depopulatura* " *esset. Etenim tunc solis oculis discernunt inter hominum genera,* " *cum quis Pallore potius aut Veste, quam fide, hæreticus æstimare-* " *tur. Hæc nequaquam placitura Martino Episcopi faciebant.*--- " *Ineunt cum Imperatore Consilium ut missis obviam Magistri of-* " *ficialibus, urbem istam* (*Martinus*) *vetaretur propius accedere.* (But it was not five Miles from all Cities and Corporations.)--- " *Interea Episcopi quorum communionem Martinus non inibat tre-* " *pidi ad Regem concurrunt, per damnatos se conquerentes actum* " *esse de suo omnium statu, si Theognisti pertinaciam, qui eos SO-* " *LUS palam lata sententia condemnaverat, Martini armaret au-* " *thoritas: Non oportuisse hominem capi mœnibus illis: Non jam* " *defensorem hæreticorum esse, sed vindicem* (Methinks I read Mr. " *Morrice*) *Nihil actum morte Priscilliani si Martinus exerceat* " *illius ultionem.* (These men have done nothing till they " have destroy'd all that are against their Tyranny.) *Postremo* " *prostrati cum fletu* (they could weep too) *& lamentatione Po-* " *testatem Regiam implorant, ut utatur adversus UNUM homi-* " *nem vi sua: Nec multum aberat quin cogeretur Imperator Mar-* " *tinum cum hæreticorum sorte miscere.*] But the Emperour know- " ing his eminent Holiness and Reputation, tryeth persuasion; " [*& blande appellat, hæreticos jure damnatos, more judiciorum* " *publicorum, potius quam in sectationibus Sacerdotum: Non esse* " *causam qua Ithacii cæterorumq; partis ejus communionem, puta-* " *ret esse damnandam, Theognistum odio potius quam causa, feciſſe* " *dissidium; Eundemq; tamen SOLUM esse qui se à communione* " *interim separavit; a reliquis nihil novatum.*] You see here that " M. *M.* saith truly, that *Martin* separated but from the Bishops " of

" of *Ithacius*'s Party: That is, All save one *Theognistus* (and " *Iginus* is elsewhere named.) Is not here a great accord of the Bishops?) [" *Quinetiam paucos ante dies habita Synodus* (Sy- " nods still) *Ithacium pronunciaverat culpa non teneri*] no won- " der: Synods have justified the forbidding of two thousand to " Preach the Gospel.) At last when no other Remedy could " save the Lives of men from the Leeches, *Martin* yielded once " to communicate with the Bishops on condition the mens " Lives should be saved: The Bishops would have had him " *Subscribe* this Communion: But that he would never do. [*Po-* " *sterodie inde se proripiens, cum revertens in viam mœstus ingemisce-* " *ret, se vel ad horam noxiæ communioni esse permixtum---sub-* " *sedit, causam doloris & facti accusante & defendente cogitatione* " *pervolvens, astitit ei repente Angelus*; Merito inquit Martine " *compungeris, sed aliter exire nequisti: Repara virtutem: resume* " *Constantiam; ne jam non periculum gloriæ, sed salutis incur-* " *reris. Itaque ab illo tempore satis cavit, cum illa Ithacianæ* " *partis communione misceri. Cæterum cum quosdam ex inergu-* " *menis, tardius quam solebat, & gratia minore curabat, subinde* " *nobis cum lachrymis fatebatur, se propter communionis illius ma-* " *lum cui se vel pancto temporis necessitate, non spiritu miscuisset, de-* " *trimentum sentire virtutis. Sedecim postea vixit annos: Nul-* " *lam Synodum adiit; ab omnibus Conventibus se removit.*] Now Reader, judge how great *Ithacius*'s Party was, that boasted but one or two men were against them: And whether *Martin* separated not from their common Synods.

Methinks I see Mr. *M.* here in the strait of the Pharisees, when put to answer whether *John*'s Baptism was from Heaven, or of men. Fain he would make *Martin* and *Sulpitius* Puritanes and Fanaticks; but the Church hath made a Holy day for *Martin*, and dedicated multitudes of Temples to his Honour; and all men reverence *Sulpitius* and him. Yet he ventures to go as far as he durst *p.* 142. against them.

§ 10. But here Mr. *M.* smarteth, and saith [*This Instance could become none worse than Mr.* B. *who in a Letter to Dr.* Hill *confesses himself to have been a Man of Blood--*]

Answ. A *Man of Blood* is your Libertine Phrase. If you would have published that secret Letter, you should 1. Have told the whole, and worded it truly; 2. And have professed your self a derider of Repentance, while you call for it. I lived in an Age of

of War, and I was on the Parliaments ſide, and that was enough to prove that I had a hand in blood while I was on one ſide, though I never drew blood of any man my ſelf (ſave once a Boy at School with boxing.)

But he thinks I ſhould have imitated *Martin* in renouncing Communion with men of blood.

Anſw. *Martin* renounced Communion with thoſe that were for deſtroying even downright Hereticks. Alas Sir, I dare not renounce Communion with theſe that Silence thouſands of faithful Miniſters, and continue ſtill to Plead, Preach, and Write for their Proſecution by Impriſonment and Ruine. I hope many do it in Ignorance, and if I do it, it may increaſe the diſtance that I wou'd heal. Nonconformiſts are no Priſcillianiſts.

And if I renounce Communion with all that were in Wars, it muſt be with ſome preſent Biſhops, and a great part of the Land.

But I underſtand you; it muſt be with all that were in Arms for the Parliament, *&c.* *Anſw.* The King then will condemn me by his Act of Oblivion, and by his own practice: Hath he not one of them for the Lord Preſident of his Council? and many more in Truſt and Honour? Did he renounce Communion with General *Monk* and his whole Army, who were long in Arms for the Parliament? Or with the Citizens, and multitudes of Commanders through the Land, who drew in, & encouraged General *Monk*? Or the Miniſters that perſuaded Sir *Tho. Allen*, Lord Mayor, to draw him in?

To be plain with you Sir (though you call it Railing) Men of your Faculty kindled the Fire, and ſet the Nation together by the Ears, and when ſad experience brought them to repentance and to deſire unity and peace, and thoſe that had fought for the Parliament had reſtored the King, this evil Spirit envyeth the Kingdom the benefit of this concord, and would fain break us again into contending Parties, and will not let King and Kingdom have peace, while God giveth us peace from all foreign enemies. Do we need any other notice what a Contentious Clergy have ſtill been, than the woful experience of what they are. If you would have had *G. Monk* and his Army, and all ſuch that joyned with him deſtroyed or excommunicate for what they had done, why did you not ſpeak out at firſt, but when we would all fain have peace and concord thus twenty years after caſt your Wild-

fire

fire you warn the Present Duke of *Albemarle* to expect to be at last called to account for his original sin.

§ 11. But his passion makes him say he knows not what, P. 142 [" I need not call Mr. *B.* to remembrance who compared " *Cromwel* to *David* and his Son to *Solomon*; But this has tran- " sported me a little too far.]

Ans. He saith this plainly of me afterward, to shew the credibility of his History? Did he know it to be false? If so, there's no disputing with him. If not, why did he not cite my words. Yea he after transcribes the Epistle meant, where he saw there were no such words: But others had told that tale before him, and that was Enough. Even as one of his tribe hath written that I have written in my Holy Common-wealth, that *any one Peer may judge the King.* If these Episcopal Historians tell forreigners that we have all Cloven Feet and Horns, and go on four legs, yea and if some swear it, we have no remedy: They can prove our noses horns, and our hands Feet.

I again tell them, If *Martins* Angel and Miracles be credible, woe to those Prelatists that are for ruining violence, and silences against men better than the *Gnosticks.* If they be not true, let them not trust too much to the best Historians.

§ 12. Of the Council at *Capua* I said that they decreed that the two Bishops and their People *should live* in loving Communion, Mr. *M.* finds me mistaken here. The words in *Binnius* are [*Ut tam Flaviani quam Evagrii fautores in Communionem Catholicam admittantur, modo Catholicæ fidei assertores inveniantur*] I thought Catholick Communion had been *Loving Communion*: And I thought if their fautors were to be received, so were they: And I thought *Antioch* had been a part of the Catholick Church, and Catholick Communion had extended to *Antioch*: But if Mr. M. deny these, I will not contend with him.

§ 13. He tells us, that [*No man with his Eyes open ever saw the Condemnation of* Bonosus *by the Council of* Capua] (for denying the Virgin Mary's perpetual Virginity.

Answ. It is Criticism and not History that the man is best at. They did it mediately, while they referred it to them that did it. Saith *Binnius* [" *Causa Bonosi cujusdam in* Macedonia *Episco-* " *pi hæretici, negantis delibatam Dei genitricis* Mariæ *Virginita-* " *tem, post partum in judicium adducta est. Synodus cognitionem* " *causæ Anysio Thessalonicensi cum Episcopis ipsi subjectis delegavit.*

" *Ab*

" *Ab Anysio Bonosum damnatum, eorumque quos ordinasset commu-*
" *nione privatum esse testatur Innoc. P.* And he knows it's a Heresie now. Yet this Council condemned Reordinations.

§ 14. That *Jovinian* a Monk was called a Heretick, for Doctrines judged sound by Protestants, is no strange thing. That one not a Bishop was the Head of a Heresie, was somewhat strange then, but not before they got too high.

As to the Question, Whether Bishops were the Chief Heads and Fomenters of Heresie, I crave his impartial Answer to these Questions. 1. Do not your selves maintain that all Churches in the world had Bishops; and that the Bishops were the Rulers, and of Chief Power? If so, can you imagine that after they had such Power, Churches could be usually made Hereticks without them?

Q. 2. Do not Councils, and all Church-History tell us how many Councils of Hereticks there have been that were Bishops?

Q. 3. If any Presbyter broke from his Bishop to set up a Heresie, was it not one that sought to be a Bishop? Or did they not make presently him or some other their Bishop and Head? Heresie or Popery had made but small progress, had it not been for Bishops.

§ 15. When I commend the *Novatians* Canon, which allowed all men Liberty for the Time of *Easter*, as better than burning men as Hereticks, he takes it for an *Immoderate Transport* that I say ["*as loud as I can speak, If all the Proud, Ambitious,* " *Heretic-acting part of the Bishops had been of this mind, O what* " *sin, what scandal, and what shame, what cruelties, confusions and* " *miseries had the Christian world escaped?*] That is, had they left such Indifferent things as Indifferent.

And is this against Moderation? I would such Zeal of God's House had more eaten me up: Dare you deny but that this course would have saved the Lives of all those thousands of *Albigenses, Waldenses,* and *Bohemians* that the Papists killed: And the death and torment of multitudes by the Inquisition? And the burning of our *Smithfield* Martyrs: And it's like most of the Wars between the Old Popes and Emperours about Investitures? And the blood of many thousand more. And it would have saved more Nations than ours from the Tearing and Division of Churches by the Ejecting and Silencing of hundreds or thousands of their Pastors, as the case of the *Germane Interim,* and other

such actions prove. And is it *Immoderate Transport* to wish all this Blood, Schism, Hatred and Confusion, and weakning and shaming of the Church had been prevented at the rate of *Tolerating Indifferent things:* No wonder if you had rather *England* still suffered what it doth, and is in danger of by Schism, than such things Indifferent shall be tolerated: It is not for nothing that Christ and *Paul* repeat, that some *have Eyes and see not, Ears and hear not*, &c.

§ 16. And here he again would make his Reader think it's true, that the Nonconformists pretend that their Silencing is for not keeping *Easter* Day at the due Time; as if this man that liveth among us did not know, that it is the *avoiding of deliberate Lying by subscribing to a known untruth*, which is the thing that they refuse; and they mention it only as an appurtenance of the Imposition *ad homines*, that it would bind them to *two different times.*

Whether, as he saith, *our disease be a wantonness fed by concession, and we are most violent when we know not what we would have*, those men are no credible Judges that for seventeen years would not endure us to speak out our Case; and when before we debated part of it, would not vouchsafe to answer us; and at last when we tell it them, do but accuse us with a sharper storm, instead of giving any thing that a man can call an Answer that ever knew the Case, *e. g.* to our *Pleas for Peace*, and my *Treatise of Episcopacy.*

§ 17. He confesseth that I praise the *African* Bishops as the best in the world, though it contradict his former charge. As to the Magnitude of Dioceses, when he hath answered my Treat. of Episcopacy, some body may be edified by him.

I agree with him that *Good men will do much Good in a great Diocese.* But 1. Worldly Bishops are so far bad: And worldly Wealth and Honour will ever be most sought by the most worldly men: And usually he that seeks shall find---*Ergo*---And 2. A good man cannot do Impossibilities: The best cannot do the work of many hundred.

Forty two years ago some wisht for the Restoring of Confession.

Theophilus Parochialis brings copious Reasons and Orders of Princes, Popes and Prelates, that all should confess to the Parish-Priest. If you had set this up here, how many men must have gone

gone to it in the Parishes of St. *Martin, Giles Cripplegate, Stepney*, &c? But how much greater work hath Dr. *Hammond*, and Old Councils, cut out for him that will be the sole Bishop of many hundred Parishes? I have named it elsewhere.

And, if any man of consideration think I have not proved against Mr. *Dodwell*, that Bishops Government is not like a King's, who may make what Officers under him he please, but depends more as a Physician's or School-master's on *Personal Ability*, I will now add but this Question to him [*Why is it that Monarchy may be hereditary, and a Child or Infant may be King*] *but an Infant may not be Bishop, nor any one not qualified with Essential Ability?* I have at large told you how sharply *Baronius* and *Binnius* condemn that odious Nullity of making a Child (by his Father's Power) A. Bishop of *Rhemes*.

If I heard twenty men say and swear that one man is sufficient to be the only Master of many hundred Schools, or Physician to many hundred Hospitals, or that one Carpenter or Mason may alone build and rear all the Houses in the City after the Fire, or one man be the sole Master of an hundred thousand Families; what can I say to him, but that he never tryed or knows the work?

§ 18. When I note that the *Donatists* took themselves for the Catholicks, and the Adversaries for Schismaticks, because they were the greater number, he very honestly saith, that *Multitude may render a Sect formidable, but it's no Argument of Right*.

Very true; nor Secular Power neither. But what better Argument have the Papists, and many others that talk against Schism?

§ 19. He thinks the *Donatists Bishops Churches were not so small as our Parishes. Answ.* Not as some: But if, as I said before, *Constantinople* in the height of all it's Glory in *Chrysostom*'s daies, had but 100000 Christians, as many as three *London*-Parishes have, judge then what the *Donatists* had.

§ 20. His double quarrel with *Binnius* and *Baronius*, let who will mind. What I gathered out of those and other Canons of the smalness of Churches then, I have elsewhere made good. His Reviling Accusations of *Envy* to their Wealth, deserveth no Answer.

§ 21. He comes to St. *Theophilus*'s Case, of which we spake

before. The Monks that reported evil of him, *were, it may be,* saith he, *downright Knaves,* The Reviling is blameless when applied to such. Doubtless they were ignorant rash Zealots: But one that reads what the *Egyptian* Monks were in *Anthony's* daies, and after, and what Miracles and Holiness, *Sulpitius Severus* reporteth of them, and why *Basil* retired into his Monastery, *&c.* may conjecture that they had much less worldliness than the Bishops, and not greater faults.

§ 22. I think it not desirable or pleasant work to vindicate the credit of *Socrates* and *Sozomen* accusing *Theophilus*: But if his Conjectures in this case may serve against express History of such men, and so near, let him leave other Histories as loose to our Conjectures. *Posthumianus* Narrative in *Sulpitius,* is but of one piece of the Tragedy. He thinks it improbable that *Origen* should be accused for making God *Incorporeal*; and such Conjectures are his Confutation of History: But *Origen* had two sort of Accusers; the Bishops, such as *Theophilus* and *Epiphanius* had worse charges against him: But the *Anthropomorphite* Monks were they that brought that Charge against him (that God had no face, hands, eyes.) And *Theophilus* before them cryed down *Origen* in general, to save his life, by deceiving them, that they might think he did it on the same account as they did. This is *Socrates* his Report of the Case.

He saith, that *the Impudent Mutinous Monks were not ashamed to tell all the world, that all that were against them were Anthropophites.*

Answ. It was other Monks that I here talk not of, that he means: It was these Monks that were *Anthropomorphites* themselves, and would have killed *Theophilus* for not being so, till he said to them, *Methinks I see your faces as the Face of God*: And the name of the Face of God did quiet them. *Hieron* was a Party against *Chrysostom*; it was for not passing that Sentence on *Origen,* that *Epiphanius* would by masterly Usurpation have imposed on him, that *Chrysostom* was by him accused.

§ 23. Could any Sobriety excuse that man *Epiphanius,* that would come to the Imperial City, and there purposely intrude into the Cathedral of one of the best Bishops in the world, for Parts and Piety, and there play the Bishop over an A. Bishop in his own Church, and seek to set all the Auditory in a flame at the time of Publick Worship, and require him to say that of *Origen,*

Origen, which he there without any Authority impoſed on him? I know not what is Pride, Uſurpation, Turbulency, if not Malignity, if this be not.

But at laſt he ſaith, ["*I do not intend to excuſe* Theophilus *in* "*this particular: (Thank Pope* Innocent) *He did certainly pro-* "*ſecute his Reſentment too far: But he was not the only man:* "Epiphanius, *a perſon of great Holineſs*; Hierom, *and ſeveral* "*other perſons renowned for their Piety, were concerned in the per-* "*ſecution of this Great man, as well as he: And to ſay the truth,* "*this is their weakneſs; for that Severity which gives men gene-* "*rally a Reputation of Holineſs, though it mortifie ſome irregular* "*heats, yet is apt to diſpoſe men to peeviſhneſs.*]

But true Holineſs ever ſincerely loveth holy men, and ſpecially ſuch as are publick Bleſſings to the Church: And though I cenſure not their main State, your *Holy Perſecutors* of the beſt of Chriſt's Servants, will never by Chriſt be judged ſmall Offenders.

Alas! it's too true that *Theophilus* was not alone: A Council of Biſhops were the Perſecutors. And it's hard to think that they loved *Chryſoſtom* as themſelves. When the forementioned Council at *Conſtantinople* had turned out *Nazianzen*, even the great magnifiers of General Councils, *Baronius* and *Binnius*, thus reproach them, that they *drove away a holy excellent man, that a man was ſet up in his ſtead that was no Chriſtian; that it was the* Epiſcopi Nundinarii *that did it, the Oriental Biſhops firſt leaving them, and going away with* Gregory. And if the *Major* Vote of that General Council were *Epiſcopi Nundinarii*, what *Chryſoſtom*'s Perſecutors were may be conjectured. Do not theſe Papiſts here ſay worſe of them than I do?

§ 24. Yet though he confeſs as much as is aforeſaid, and bring but his Conjectures mixt with palpable omiſſions againſt the expreſs words of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, he hath the face to make up his failing with this Calumny ["*I have dwelt ſo long on* "*this, not only to vindicate* Theophilus, *but to ſhew once for all the* "*manner of our Author's dealing with his Reader in his Church-* "*Hiſtory. Any ſcandalous Story, though it be as falſe and impro-* "*bable as any in the* Anni Mirabiles, *or* Whites Centuries *of Scan-* "*dalous Miniſters, any Fiction that reflects with diſgrace on* "*Biſhops and Councils is ſet down for authentick, no matter who* "*delivers it, friend or foe.*]

Anſw.

Anſw. Are not *Baronius* and *Binnius* friends to the higheſt Prelacy? Doth not he himſelf ſay that *Socrates is a credible Hiſtorian?* Is his Authority weighty enough to diſcredit them whom he contradicts? Hath he proved one word falſe that I have ſaid of *Theophilus?* Is not *Chryſoſtom* as credible as he? Doth he not know how ill he is ſpoken of by a great number of *Chryſoſtom*'s Defenders? And how ſmartly *Iſidore Peluſiota* reflects on him?

But who could have diſgraced him more, than he that will imply that the things mentioned of him are as true as what is ſaid in *White's Centuries of Scandalous Miniſters*, or the *Anni Mirabiles*. I know not all or moſt things in either of them. But he was a ſtranger in *England* that had not credible Teſtimony of divers of the things in the *Anni Mirabiles*. And Mr. *White*, the Chairman of that Parliament-Committee, was commonly reputed a grave and godly credible man; and if he lied, the whole Committee muſt concur in the Lie; and the Witneſſes muſt all be falſe. I will not further meddle in ſo unpleaſant a buſineſs, than to tell you, that all that I knew accuſed of Scandal, had Witneſſes of it, that in the places where they lived were thought to make as much conſcience of a Lie, as the beſt of their Neighbours: And whether ſuch a mans ſcorn that was then in the ſhell, is in Hiſtory a ſufficient proof that Committees of Parliament, and Witneſſes, were all Lyars, I leave to conſideration. I well know what School-maſters and Curates I was bred under, and what the two Miniſters were that were ſequeſtred in the place where I after came: And all the Country can tell you. They conſtrained me to name them, and the Caſe in my Apology for our Preaching, and my Anſwer to Mr. *Hinkley*: It's yet the ſame Age: Any may enquire of them.

§ 25. As to his Note of *Altars*, I doubt not but there were at the Memorials of Martyrs *Commemeratory Altars* erected in the third or fourth Centuries: But what's that to *Communicatory Altars*? and thoſe in the firſt and ſecond Century?

§ 26. I ſuppoſe he wrote againſt my Book upon ſome others Reading. I did in a Parentheſis ſay (*Innocent* Excommunicated *Theophilus*, *Arcadius* and the Empreſs.) And of another matter added; *yet did this paſs without contradiction*: And he confounds them, and ſaith, [*Any thing paſſeth with him for Hiſtory: This Epiſtle of* Innocent *is all forged.*] *Anſw.* I ſee not his proof: But

I had

I had rather it were proved falſe than true: But when I ſpeak againſt Papal Uſurpation (be the men never ſo good) I think to ſuch *Binnius* and *Baronius* are meet Witneſſes.

§ 27. *Boniface*'s Decree of exempting Biſhops from Civil Judicatures, he thinks not ſo Antient, and ſaith, We have only the Authority of *Gratian* for it: But his Conjecture and a flirt at me is all the Confutation: And he cannot doubt but that Exemption hath ſufficiently priviledged Biſhops ſince then: As is after proved.

CHAP. XXI.

Of the firſt Council of Epheſus, *&c. His Cap.* 5.

§ 1. OUR Accuſer in his Fifth Chapter paſſeth by the juſt Praiſes which I give to Peaceable Biſhops, as croſſing his Slander that I diſpraiſe all, or ſuch as well as the unpeaceable, whoſe Juſtification it is that he undertaketh.

§ 2. He begins with an Accuſation, that [*to prejudice the Reader againſt* Cyril's *Council, I give the worſt account of him that I could patch up out of all the Libels and Accuſations of his Enemies.*]

Anſw. If by *Prejudice* be meant *Informing him of Hiſtory*; and by *Worſt* is meant *Impartial Recitation* of what Hiſtory ſaith; and by *Patching up* be meant ſuch *Reciting*; and by *Enemies* be meant the *beſt and moſt credible Hiſtorians* that have written of it, then this is true: Elſe it is the work of that Undertaker that is engaged to call *Evil Good*, and *Darkneſs Light*, and preferreth ſpeaking good of bad actions, before ſpeaking truly.

§ 3. And that you may know by what Spirit men that will not reproach the beſt that differ from the Prelates, are themſelves reproached by this Sect, and alſo what ſort of Hiſtory this man giveth the Lie to, on pretence of giving it me, and how far he is from Railing, he thus proceedeth.

["The firſt thing he is charged with is the Oppreſſion of the "*Novatians*. This was enough with *Socrates* or *Sozomen* to "paint him as ugly as men do the Devil or Antichriſt; and "there-

" therefore there is no great credit to be given them in these " Relations, as manifestly espousing the Cause and Quarrel of " the *Novatians*.]

Answ. 1. Just as *Thuanus* or *Erasmus* espoused the Cause of the Protestants by Truth and Peace, when others hated and belied them. 2. Methinks the man revileth me very gently in comparison of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, the two most impartial and credible of all our Antient Church-Historians (with *Theodorot.*) But who can wonder that he imitateth that which he defendeth.

§ 4. But he saith, [*It may be the* Novatians *deserved it--- and it's not unlikely that they were very troublesom and seditious.*]

Answ. It's *not unlikely* now that others will say it was so. But mark Reader which of these Historians is most credible [*Socrates* and *Sozomen* lived with those that knew the things and persons: They have told us Truth in the rest of their Histories: If they had been *Novatians*, Mr. *M.* saith, They believed sinning after Baptism had no pardon or absolution: And were they not like then to fear such Lying and false Accusing as paints a Saint like the Devil or Antichrist.] On the other side [Mr. *M.* liveth above a thousand years after them: He is one of the Party that take it to be not only lawful, but a duty to say and swear all that is imposed now, which I will not here describe: How truly he writes the History of his own Age, even of Parliament and Wars, and living persons, I have told you. He saith no more against the Historians credit here, but [*it may be*] and [*it's not unlikely*] and [*they were* Novatians, Schismaticks, Alexandrians.] Even so their Counterminer, and many Conformists, that have many years reported us to be Raising a War against the King, had their [*May-be's*] and [*It's not unlikely*] and [*they are Schismaticks*] *to prove it*: And others soon rose up and swore it. And when some lament their Perjury, it stops not the rest. But some have such *Free-will*, that they can believe whom they list.

§ 5. *Socrates*, saith he, *makes it part of his charge that he took on him the Government of temporal Affairs. This was not the Usurpation of the Bishop, but the Indulgence of the Emperour*: And he shews the Churches need of it.

Answ. That which he is charged with is, that *he was the first Bishop that himself used the Sword.* And 1. Do you think that so great a Patriarchate & Dioceses would not find a conscionable

nable Paſtor work enough, without joyning with it the Magiſtrates Office? 2. Was not the Church greatly changed even ſo early from what it was a little before in the daies of *Martin* and *Sulpitius*, when even *Ithacius* durſt not own being ſo much as a ſeeker to the Magiſtrate to draw the Sword againſt groſs Hereticks; and the beſt Biſhops denied Communion with them that ſought it: And now a Biſhop himſelf becomes the ſtriker not of groſs Hereticks, but ſuch as peaceable Biſhops bore with.

I remember not to have read that *Cyril* had any Commiſſion for the Sword from the Emperour: Others then had not: But I deny it not.

§ 6. He ſaith, that elſewhere I ſay [*I ſhall not diſhonour ſuch, nor diſobey them.*] *Anſw.* I ſay and do ſo: If a Biſhop will take another Calling from the King's Grant, when he hath undertaken already 40 times more work as a Dioceſan than he can do, Ile honour and obey him as a Magiſtrate: But I would be loth to ſtand before God under the guilt of his undertaking and omiſſions.

§ 7. As to all the reſt of the Hiſtory about *Cyril*'s Executions, and the wounding of *Oreſtes* the Governour, I leave it between the Credit of Mr. *M.* and *Socrates.*: And *he very much ſuſpects the Story of* Cyril's *making a Martyr of him that was executed for it*: I leave all to the Reader's Judgment. I think I may tranſcribe *Socrates* without ſlandering *Cyril.*

Here his ſpleen riſing, ſaith [*There are men in the world that honour ſuch as Martyrs for murdering a King.*]

Anſw. You may ſmell what he inſinuates: I think he will not ſay, that he ever did more againſt them than thoſe that they call Presbyterians have done. We Wrote and Preacht againſt them when he did not. I know not the Presbyterian living to my remembrance, that was not againſt the Murder of the King, and *Prin*, whom the Biſhops had cropt and ſtigmatized for being againſt them, as an *Eraſtian*, was the hotteſt in the Parliament, for the Execution of the King's Judges: But I knew divers Conformiſts that have written or ſpoken to juſtifie or excuſe that Fact.

§ 8. As for the Murder of *Hypatia*, I leave him to his ſcuffle with *Socrates* and *Damaſcius*, in which I intereſs not my ſelf.

§ 9. I thank Pope *Innocent* Mr. *M.* durſt not deny *Cyril*'s

faults, in his Enmity to the memory of *Chryſoſtom*; and yet he calls my reciting the matter of Fact a *reproach*. He is conſtrained to confeſs ["*That the Quarrel was it ſeems hereditary to him*" (ſo is Original Sin) *and he did proſecute it beyond all equity or decency againſt the memory of a dead man: This was a fault, and and he that is without any, or without any particular animoſity, ſpecially if he be in any eminent place, let him caſt the firſt ſtone.*]

Anſw. Thanks to Conſcience: We feel your Animoſities: But is not this man a Railing Accuſer of *Cyril*, if I am ſuch? What ſaith he leſs in the main? Yea he now renews his Accuſation of his Predeceſſor, ſaying, *It was hereditary*. To proſecute malice againſt the very name of a holy extraordinary Biſhop, beyond *all equity and decency*---what will Chriſtianity or Humanity call it? But Faction ſaith, *it was a fault, and he that is without any*, &c. Thus talkt *Eli* to his Sons: So one may ſay, To Silence 2000 Miniſters, or to hate the beſt men, and ſeek their ruine, is *a fault*, a Prelatical peccadillo; and ſo was *Bonner*'s uſage of the Martyrs; and let him that is without any caſt the firſt ſtone. And Sr. *John* ſaith, *He that hateth his Brother is a murderer*, and none ſuch hath Eternal Life abiding in him; and that as *Cain*, he is of the Evil One, the Devil. And I believe him.

§ 10. But he ſaith, *I injuriouſly charge him with calling* Alexander *a bold faced man, when* Atticus *was the firſt Author of that word.*

Anſw. Atticus mentioned *Alexander*'s confident, true and neceſſary Counſel; *Cyril* contradicting it, calls the man, *A man of a confident face or mouth.* If another Biſhop ſaid the firſt words before him, do I wrong him in ſaying he ſaid the *ſecond?* O tender men! His urging the keeping up the names of ſuch as *Nectarius* and *Arſacius*, and caſting out *Chryſoſtomus*, is ſo like our Canons about Readers and Nonconformiſts, and our Canoneers deſcriptions of their Country Parſons, and the Puritanes, that I wonder not that you defend him.

§ 11. But he ſaith, that *It's a little unchriſtian to blaſt his memory with the faults which he corrected in his life-time.*]

Anſw. 1. It's neceſſary to tell that truth which blaſteth the Reputation of ſuch ſin as was growing up towards Papacy. *Anſ.* 2. Then Chriſt was unchriſtian to tell the Jews of their very Fathers murders of the Prophets, while they diſclaimed it, and built their Sepulchres, *Mat.* 23. And then it was unchriſtian in the

the Holy Ghoſt, to blaſt the memory of *Adam*, *Noe*, *Lot*, *David* *Solomon*, *Peter*, yea or *Manaſſeh*, with ſins repented of. 3. Hiſtory muſt ſpeak truth about things *repented* of; or elſe it will but deceive the world. 4. The Honour of God, and Goodneſs, and Truth, muſt be preferred before our own Honour. Repentance, if true, will moſt freely confeſs a mans own ſin, and moſt fully ſhame it.

§ 12. Whether all his far-fetcht Conjectures that *Cyril* repented, be true or no, is nothing to me. I will hope he did, though I never ſaw it proved: The very laſt Sentence of Death might do it. His retortion is, [*I know no man deeper engaged in the Contentions of the Church* (than I) *The writing of his Eighty Books being but like ſo many pitcht Battels he has fought, and moſt commonly in the dark, when he was hardly able to diſcover friend from foe.*]

Anſw. It's too true, that being all written for Peace, the Enemies of Peace have fought againſt them. *Nimis diu habitavit, anima mea inter oſores pacis.* But *pro captu Lectoris*, &c. All men take not the words of ſuch as he for Oracles. How much I have written and done for Peace, let others read and judge. I long laboured and begg'd for Peace in vain with ſuch as he defendeth. And it's admirable if this pittileſs Enemy of Sects and Errours can be for all the Sects and Errours that I have written againſt. Have I in the dark taken for foes by Errour the Atheiſts, the Infidels, the Sadducees, the Hobbiſts, the Quakers, the Ranters, the Papiſts, the Socinians, the Libertines called Antinomians, the Anabaptiſts, the Separatiſts, and Sects as Sects? Be of good comfort all: Theſe Prelatiſts that accuſe us for too dark and ſharp Writings againſt you, ſeem to tell you that they will more hate perſecuting or diſtreſſing you; Yes when they agree with themſelves.

His Prayer that I may have a more *honorable* opinion of Repentance he calls me to ſpeak to in the End.

§ 13. Whether good *Iſidore Peluſiota* were a man [*"very "eaſy to take any impreſſions, and upon falſe information chargeth "Cyril with proſecuting his private quarrels with* Neſtorius *"under pretence of zeal for the faith*] I leave all men to believe our Accuſer as they ſee cauſe. And the ſame I ſay of that which is ſo great a Controverſie among the Critical Hiſtorians, whether *Theodorets* Epiſtle to *Job. Ant.* againſt *Cyril* be Counterfeit, or

were written on a falſe rumour of *Cyrils* death. Their 5th General Council hath it. *Baronius* and *Binnius* ſay, ſome *Eutychian* knave hath corrupted the Acts of that Council. Muſt Councils be the Laws of all the world, and hath the Church and *Tradition* kept them no better, that we know not when we have them truly? Leave us then to the univerſal Laws of God.

§ 14. He ſaith truly that [*the Council of* Epheſus *was chiefly directed by the authority of* Cyril] *Anſ.* And ſo was that at *Trent* by the authority of the Pope And when he hath confuted the credible Hiſtory wich tells us of the womens and Courtiers hatred of *Neſtorius*, and proved that the Emperour and *Pulcheria* the Empreſs were but one, I will grant that the *authority of the Court directed not Cyril*; and that then and now Biſhops neither were nor are directed by the Civil powers.

§ 15. When I ſpake againſt *Neſtorius* his cruelty to Sectaries he asketh [*What Hereticaters were hotter than the Preſbyterians in* 1646. *The Inquiſition is not more ſevere than their ordinance againſt Hereſies, which they deſired ſhould be made felony and puniſhed by death &c.*]

Anſ. Reader Judge of the mans Credit as to ancient Hiſtory ſtill by his truth about the Preſent age. 1. The *Inquiſition* he ſaith, *is not more ſevere.* Do I need to anſwer this to any man of 50 years of age? It's Capable of no anſwer but what he will call by ſome name deſerved by his own.

2. I can find no ſuch ordinance: He ſaith It *was offered*? Is that all? And by whom? Was it the body of the Presbterians, or who?

3. What were the Hereſies named by them? Were they not down right Blaſphemy?

4. Who and how many were ever either tormented or put to death for Hereſie, from 1641 till 1660: I remember not one, ſave that *James Nayler* was impriſoned and whipt, and had his Tongue bored for blaſphemous Perſonating Chriſt, and that not by the Presbyterians.

5. Why are they ſo ordinarily reproached by the Prelatiſts for tolerating all Sects here in *England*?

6. What if all this had been true? What is it to me or any of my mind? I never had a hand in perſecuting one man, to my remembrance. How few can you name of all the Nonconformiſts now in *England*, that had any hand in the Severities you mention?

mention? I know not four in *England*, that I remember. And what's this to us any more than to you?

7. And was it well done, or ill? If well, why do you liken them to the Inquisition? Are you for it? If ill, why do you plead for it in others? Imitate it not if you dislike it.

For my part, as I am against all Sects as such, I am much more against the cruelty of any. I stick no more at the disgracing the Presbyterians sins, than yours: And I am readier to disgrace my own than either, if I can know them. I would cherish Errours no more than you; but I would not ruine or imprison even such of your selves as have too many. Heresie must have its proper cure. I thank God I had once an Orthodox agreeing Flock. But again I say, the Presbyterians were too impatient with Dissenters; and it's better have variety of Fish in the Pond, than by the Pikes to reduce them to special unity.

§ 16. He saith that *Nestorius consequentially denyed the God-Head of Christ*. p. 192. Next he hath found a contradiction in my words, that the *Emperor was weary of this stir*: And yet that [*Cyril did it to please the Court*] These critical men can make their two hands enemies to each other. How came he waking to dream that this was a contradiction, when Historians tell us that the Women and Courtiers hated both *Chrysostome* and *Nestorius*? He implyeth that the *Emperor* and the *Court* were all one, or of one mind. But I am not bound to believe him, no more than of many other Emperours whose Wives kept up one party and they another. And I pray you why should we be confident that *Theodosius* 2. himself called an *Eutychian* by the hereticating Bishops, was not against *Nestorius* when he called that Council, & at first Condemned both him and *Cyril*, and after him alone? I did but recite the Historians words, and was that *forgetfulness*?

§ 17. His many words about this controversie with *Nestorius* are the most unworthy of any answer of all his Books: sometime he saith as I, as p. 193 [*It had been happy for the Church if the mysteries of our Religion had never been curiously disputed*: sometime he confesseth *that* Nestorius *spake the same thing with* Cyril, *that Christ had two natures in one Person*: ibid. *And that he expresseth himself one would think very orthodoxly*. p. 202. *But the Heretick dissembled and hid his sence*. And so this man after above 1000 years knew the mans mind to be contrary to his words: whereas it's palpable to him that readeth the Histories, that the

man was so far from *hiding* and *dissembling*, that he was sowrly and morosely addicted to stick to the words and Notions he had espoused, and too little to regard a peaceable complyance to mollifie his accusers. His fault lay on the clean contrary side, But he proveth him a Heretick that meant *Christ* was two *Persons*, though he said the contrary, 1. Because he saith that the Humane Nature was united in *dignity* and *honour* to the Divine.

Ans. As if either the hypostatical union were denyed by those words, or he knew that *Nestorius* meant not to include it in those terms:

But he saith he useth the word προσωπον, and not ὑποστασις *Ans.* As if προσωπον never signifyed more than a Relative or official Person, when besides the many places cited by *Derodon*, *Nestorius* oft explaineth himself in the common orthodox sence.

But the foulest charge is, that he seems once or twice to distinguish Christ from the Divine Nature. *Ans.* By [Christ] he expresseth himself to mean the *humane nature anointed to his Office*: And the man thought that the Divine Nature was not so anointed: and distinguishing is not dividing.

It is not his *Nay* and my *Yea* that can inform any Reader what *Nestorius* said and meant without reading his own words (rather than *Cyrils* of him.) And if such as Mr *M.* will pretend Charity, and contrary to plain evidence face down the world that a *Man denyeth consequentially Christs God-Head, and the Unity of his Person*, while he profest the contrary, no mans innocency is sufficient to escape the fangs of such hereticaters: And let him call me what his list inclineth him to call me, I again profess that on the reading of *Cyril*, *Nestorius*, and the Council, and *Derodon*'s Citations, I am quite past doubt that the controversy was Verbal, which of them *spake orthodoxly* while they both meant the same thing; and when one said *Mary was the Mother of God*, and the other said, no; *She was but the Mother of that Person who is God*; the *fitness* of the phrase was the matter of their quarrel.

And consider 1 Many think that when a high point is in controversy to the danger of the Church, we must use the exactest phrases, and not say all that may be justified.

2. And as *forma dat nomen*, so *loquitur formalis*, or denominating *à forma* is more exact and proper than *à materia*: And therefore though *idioms* may be Communicated, he that in controversie denomi-

denominateth the Divine Nature from its own properties, speaks more exactly.

3. If one should in our Pulpits say ordinarily [*The World was Created by Man*:] *The eternal proceeding of the Holy Ghost was from a Man*: *Flesh and Blood was from Eternity*;] many sound Christians would not like it. And yet it's true in the Communicative sense, *viz.* [He that is now man made the world as God: The Holy Ghost eternally proceeded from the 2d Person in the Trinity who is now God and Man: Christ who was flesh and blood on Earth, was Eternal as God.] So if one now say [God was confined to the Virgins Womb, and to the Manger: God could not speak in the Infancy of Christ: God was but about 30 year old when Christ was Baptized: God knew not the day nor the hour of Christs second coming: God was alleep, hungry, sorrowful, in an agony, crucified, dead, buried, *&c.*]. All this is thus far true, *viz.* Of *Christ* who was God, not as God but as man: And yet if I should deny but the *fitness* of *this* speaking, I were just such an Heretick as *Nestorius* was: And many that are no Hereticks for all that would not relliſh it.

Either my Eyes could not find that in *Nestorius* which he affirms of him or else he is a meer slanderer of him, when he saith Pag. 193 that he *denyed* Yea obstinately] that *Mary was the Mother of that Person who was God.*] He hath produced no such word. That which he stood to was, that instead of *saying Mary was the Mother of God*, we should say *she was the Mother of Christ who is God and Man.* And of the unity of Person I have cited already his own words so fully, as moved *Dorodon* to say [*I dare boldly say, no Christian hath hitherto spoken trulyer and plainer of the unity of Christs Person in two natures than* Nestorius] And that it's false that he confest but an union of dignity the same cited words shew: *Nexu adeo sublimi* (saith he) *Divinoque & admirabili* (mentioning the conjunction of the Divinity and humanity) *ut Divina natura ea sibi vendicet quæ Corporis alioquin sint propria*] Epist. ad Cyril.

And as to all his justifications of *Cyril*, he knoweth that I justify his Doctrine as well as he, but not the work that he made, which is not undone among Nations of *Nestorians* to this day. But if the man were able to be impartial, and so happy as not to draw on himself the guilt of such sins by justifying them, he might easily see in his own confession that *Cyril* the Hereticator spake

ſpake as bad at leaſt as *Neſtorius*. He oft confeſſeth (for he cannot deny it) [*that he doth frequently own but one nature*] p. 197. and 198. [*that there is but one nature of the word incarnate*] ſo p. 201. *&c.* But *Cyril* meant well, that is, by *Nature* he meant *Perſon*. And was not this *Eutychian* Speech as improper as *Neſtorius*'s is? Is the *nature* and *Perſon* to be confounded? Did the Fathers ſpeak thus? If *Nature* put for *Perſon* be pardonable, why is it not pardonable to prefer a denomination a *proprietate vel forma*, to another? And thus you make *Cyril* to differ from the *Eutychians*, in their different meanings while they uſed the ſame words. If I had ſaid that Chriſt had but one *Nature* I ſhould have had a cenſure otherwiſe meaſured.

And though this man ſeem to deny it, I have cited many of his words in which he ſaith [*Duas naturas unitas aſſerimus: poſt unionem vero tanquam adempta jam in duas diſtinctione, unam eſſe credimus filii naturam, tanquam unius ſed inhumati & incarnati & adſucceſ. Nihil injuſti facimus dicentes, ex duabus naturis factum eſſe concurſum in unitatem: Poſt unionem vero non diſtinguimus naturas ab invicem.* But I have cited enough before.

The ſum and truth is, to judge no one but my ſelf, I muſt be blind by ignorance or partiality if I be not paſt doubt, 1. That unskilful explication was their difference. 2. That *Cyrils* words were *Eutychian*. 3. That *Neſtorius* words were orthodox in the main, but not ſufficiently yielding to a tolerable phraſe. 4. That they both meant the ſame thing. 5. That all their war was managed, 1. For want of diſtinguiſhing fully the *Abſtract* [*Deitatem*] and the *Concrete* [*Deum*] 2. For want of diſtinguiſhing [*Qui Deus*] from [*Qua Deus*] and a ſtrict formal expreſſion from a more laxe that's tolerable. And 3. For want of diſtinguiſhing [*diviſion*] from [*diſtinction*] of natures. 4. For want of explaining the various ſorts and ſenſes of [*Unity*] and [*Plurality.*] I cannot but know this to be true, though Mr. *M.* ſcorn me for it.

What [*I that underſtand not the language they wrote in to pretend to know better than the Council?*] *Anſ.* 1. So ſay the Papiſts: what? will you pretend to know more than the Church and Councils? If it be implicite faith that they are bringing us to, let them tell us which Councils we muſt ſo believe when they condemn each other? 2. I thought I could make ſhift to underſtand their language, though I be no critick in it: But if he know me

me better, I ſtrive not for the reputation of Learning; not only *Baronius* and *Binnius*, and all the reſt that he nameth that had no skill in Greek, but moſt of the Schoolmen, ſeem to me without it, far more Learned than he. I can tell him of Lads whoſe Learning I admire not, that ſhall vie with him in Languages Oriental and Occidental, and give him odds; And when he ſcorns *Derodons* diſtinctions, telling us it's *making two bad Groats by ſlitting a Sixpence*, &c. I leave him to glory in his Confuſion: But I ſuſpect the Fox that ſpeaks againſt Tails is like enough to want one himſelf.

But when he hath ſhewed in all this Hiſtory of *Neſtorius*, *Cyril*, and the Council, little but that partiality which can talk confidently to the ignorant for any cauſe, without any ſhew of confuting *Derodons* juſtification of *Neſtorius*, or my Conciliation, his craft or paſſion attempts to divert the Reader by the art of the times, and as if it muſt ſtop our Mouths from lamenting the ſin of Hereticators, and miſery of the Church thereby, he tells us how men in theſe times call themPapiſts that are none.

Anſ. If it be ill done, why condemn you your ſelf by defending thoſe that did the like? If it was well done in Biſhops Councils, why not in them? 2. But what's this to me, if it be not me that he means? If it be, 1. If you will read but the laſt part of my *Cathol. Theolog.* judge of the mans front. 2. It is none but thoſe that are for a humane Soveraignty over all the Church on Earth that we judge Papiſts: And if you judge them not ſuch, we will thank you to tell us what a Papiſt is in your own ſenſe.

§ 18. His ſaying *p.* 225. that [*John Comes that gives a ſad account of the Council is much to be ſuſpected*, &c. doth but tell us that he would have your belief of Hiſtory guided by the Intereſt of his Cauſe.

§ 19. As to his ſcorn againſt my tranſlating the words [*the Scripture and Sacred*] which mean that imperial Scripture, I did think a litteral Tranſlation could not have been judged a miſunderſtanding or miſtranſlation: Why may they not be called in *Engliſh* what they are called in *Greek*? And he had a ſtrong imagination if he thought that *Haumers* Tranſlation of *Euſebius*, &c. afforded me ſuch materials as theſe.

§ 20. His concluſion of ſome that ſcorn to preach by the *Licence* of the Government I before mentioned. The Truth and

miniſterial Honeſty of it, is much like as if Thouſands ſhould petition the Biſhop, that their ſick families may have licenſed Phyſicians, and he rejecteth all their Petitions, and prevaileth with the Parliament to do the like: At laſt the King pittieth them, and licenſeth the Phyſicians, and the Biſhop and his Clergy are offended, and get it revoked, and the Phyſicians practiſe at their peril without licenſe: And our credible Hiſtorian ſhould record it, that they ſcorned to practiſe as licenſed by the Government, even while ſtill they make all the Friends they can to the Clergy to be licenſed, and are not able to prevail. But the ages that knew not them and us, that are to come, may poſſibly believe theſe men as they believe their Predeceſſors.

§21. To conclude, Reader, if now thou have any ſenſe of Chriſtian Intereſt, Unity and Love, judge of the whole caſe impartially, and begin with notorious matter of fact.

1. We find at this day a great Body of Chriſtians, called *Neſtorians*, inhabiting the Countries of *Babylon*, *Aſſyria*, *Meſopotamia*, *Parthia*, and *Media*, yea, ſpread Northerly to *Cataya*, and Southerly to *India*; abundance of them even in *Tartary*, ſaith *Paulus Venet.* See *Brierwood* p. 139. And we find that they are by the Weſtern Churches, if not the *Greeks*, called Hereticks, and at the eaſieſt Schiſmaticks. And yet as thoſe very Friars that have lived among them ſay, they are commonly free from any ſuch Opinions as are charged on them, but only honour the name of *Neſtorius*, and condemned the Councils that condemned him. This Mr. *M.* nor no Prelate will deny that retaineth humanity.

2. We find that this woful fraction hath continued about one Thouſand two Hundred and thirty Years.

3. We are put to enquire what was and is the cauſe; and we find that on both ſides it is the Biſhops and their Clergy that now continue it, and it was Patriarchs and their Biſhops that at firſt cauſed it.

4. We enquire how they did it: And Mr. *Morrice* confeſſeth that it began in a diſpute between the two Patriarchs (whether the Virgin *Mary* was to be called *The Mother of God*, or rather *The Mother of Jeſus Chriſt who is God and Man*: and that on this occaſion *Cyril* charged *Neſtorius*, as making Chriſt to be two Perſons, and he himſelf ſaid Chriſt incarnate had but *one Nature*, but had no more skill in ſpeaking, than by *one Nature* to mean

mean *one Person*, (though *Derodon* labour to prove that he meant worse,) that *Nestorius* professed two Natures in one Person. And Mr. *M.* saith, *Nestorius* when he spake well meant ill, and *Cyril* when he spake ill meant well. And upon this a General Council itself is first divided about them, even to blows: and after by the importunity of *Cyril*'s party, *Nestorius* is banished, and the Bishops divided, some for one, and some for another to this day. Another Council is called at *Calcedon*, and confirmeth the Condemnation, and the *Nestorian* Bishops condemn that Council, and for many Ages the Bishops were divided also about that, one part condemning it, and the other subscribing to it, and honouring it. Judge now what these Bishops have done to Christian Religion and the Church of Christ, and continue to do: And if you dare join with our Canoneers in making the guilt your own, by justifying such dismal work; the further you go, the more of it you have to justifie, till your Souls have guilt and load enough.

Honest Dr. *Moore* charged with Nestorianism, is fain to accuse *Nestorius* out of his Enemies words to clear himself. That he owned not a [*Physical Union of Natures*] is an ambiguous, unsafe word: A Physical Union seems to signifie one φύσις which is not to be said. He never denied a personal or Hypostatical Union. And if he had (as he did not) opposed the word *Hypostasis*, so did *Hierom* that was no Heretick, and many more for a long time.

I suppose Mr. *M.* is not more zealous against Nestorianism than the Hereticating Church of *Rome* is: And how great they really thought the *Nestorian* Heresie, the story which I mention of *P. Hormisda* tells you, which I will repeat. [There arose a controversie whether it might be said that [*One of the Trinity was crucified*,] Pope *Hormisda* said [*No*] because they that were for it were suspected to be *Eutychians*: The *Nestorians* laid hold on this, and said, [*Then we may not say that* Mary *was the Parent of one of the Trinity.*] This was a hard case: *Justinian* sent to Pope *John* about it. His infallibility and *Hormisda*'s were contrary: he and his Council say that we may say, that [*One of the Trinity was crucified.*] Hereupon *Baronius* and *Binnius* give us a useful note, [*Ita mutatis hostibus arma mutari necesse fuit.*] What should the World do if we had not had such a Judge of Controversies. I hope Mr. *M.* will not be so heretical, or schismatical,

as to say that either of these Popes erred against an Article of Faith: But will rather recant his Accusation of *Nestorius*, and number this with *Things Indifferent*, which the Church hath power to change at her pleasure.

CHAP. XXII.

Of the Council of Ephesus 2d.

§ 1. THat our Historian may justifie the Dividers he makes himself a Party, and by downright mistake against both faith, 1. That *Nestorius fell into Blasphemy, denying Christ to be true God.* 2. And that *Eutyches denied Christ to be true Man.*] This is our Reformer of History; when both of them professed Christ to be true God, and true man. I doubt not but the Man can write another Book to justifie this; for what is it that some cannot talk for? Yea, he is at it again, *p.* 230. that *Eutyches* held Christ not to be *true Man.*

§ 2. He confesseth again that *Cyril* affirmeth but *one Nature*, and meant but *one Person*, and that *Eutyches* used the same words, but saith, *sure they cannot be so mad as to fall out so violently when they say the same thing & words.* Flavian *could not be so foolish or so wicked*,&c. *Ans.* I justifie not the words of *Eutyches* or *Cyril*; but if I have great reason to believe, that as he confesseth *Cyril* so gross as to use φύσις for ὑπόστασις, so *Eutyches* who had far less Learning than *Cyril*, did word amiss the conceptions, which were the same with *Cyrils*, I leave it to this mild Censurer to call them *Fools*, and *mad*, and *wicked.* It's taken for railing in me to blame them.

§ 3. He saith [*Cyril never said there were two Natures in Christ before the Union. Ans.* I have twice cited his words: Find a true difference between them and those of *Eutyches* if you can. I believe they both meant better than they spake.

§ 4. But the Spirit of detraction useth to fetch Accusations from *Hearts*,& *Thoughts*,and *secret Actions*,and so doth he against *Eutyches*; and he saith *this hath been done of late times, To deliver that in select Meetings, which they will not in publick promiscuous Assemblies: as evil Spirits are under restraint in consecrated places.* *Ans.*

Anſ. Therefore it is that the Nonconformiſts have 20 or 19 years ſo earneſtly beg'd for leave to preach in publick conſecrated places to promiſcuous Aſſemblies, that they might be out of ſuſpicion, but could never obtain it of this ſort of Maſters. *Ex ore tuo*--- Thus they that caſt the ſtone at others oft find it hit themſelves. Mr. *Edwards Gangrena* is here commended to thoſe that are for Toleration. As if all differences were equally intolerable or tolerable: And he that ſaith [*Tolerate not thoſe that preach Blaſphemy or intolerable errour*,] ſaid no worſe than he that ſaith [*Silence Two Thouſand Preachers, unleſs they will Profeſs, Promiſe, and Swear, and do all that is (oft deſcribed) impoſed on them.*

§ 5. In his Narrative he is no more tender of the honour of Biſhops it ſeems than I am, nor ſo much of Emperours; for when he had ſaid the Emperour [*was too much addicted to this kind of Vermine* (Eunuchs) *and ſhews his bitterneſs againſt* Flavian, he ſaith that *the Letters which called this Council ſuggeſted ſufficiently what it was to do, and that their buſineſs was to condemn a Biſhop the Emperour did not care for, though without any juſt ground, nay, for his honeſty.*

I deny none of this: But were the Biſhops of the Catholick Church in a good caſe then, that, when they knew before that they were called to ſuch a work as this, would meet in a General Council and do it? No; he accuſeth them himſelf, I need not do it.

The Emperour, he ſaith, *knew how to chooſe Biſhops*, (and yet his Summons was general to all to come,) and the *Preſident, if half be true that is ſaid of him*, (and if that be a doubt, how credible are your Hiſtorians?) *was one of the moſt wicked, profligate Wretches in the World*,] yet he was one of the Patriarchs, and all the Council Biſhops, and till they met, were not thus accuſed. You ſee the man is a far greater railer than I even againſt Biſhops: But it is but againſt thoſe that are againſt his Intereſt and ſide.

§ 6. He deſcribes thoſe Biſhops as uſing violence, forgetting that it is it his Party truſteth to continually: juſt with the front as *Baronius* and *Binnius*, and many other Papiſts, juſtifie *Martin* for being againſt putting Hereticks to death, and condemn *Ithacius*, while their Kingdom is upheld by that which they condemn, and worſe, even the burning of true Chriſtians as Hereticks, and it's Heretical with them to imitate *Martin*, juſt as thoſe

those *Matth.* 23. Your Fathers killed the Prophets, and you build their Sepulchers, and say if we had lived in the days of our Fathers, we would not, *&c.*

§ 7. But in the passage I find our Historian in a more charitable mood to this *Ephesine* Council of Bishops than his Brethren, [*How bad soever* Dioscorus *and this Council were, yet they are in my judgment to be looked on rather as favourers of Heresie than Hereticks, they followed the meaning I believe as well as the Words of* Cyril.] *Anſ.* And now I may hope I am Orthodox and Charitable when I have no less than his Judgment to justifie mine. And *Anatolius* justifieth us both.

§ 8. But Sir, now you are in a good Mood, will you consider,

1. Whether those Bishops and Councils that set the Christian World in that Flame that burneth dreadfully to this day, after above 1200 Years, were not guilty at least of a peccadillo or venial sin.

2. Whether they are imitable.

3. Whether this General Council had a supream Legislative and Judicial power over all the Church on Earth, which all must obey and none must appeal from.

No: saith Bishop *Gunning, It was a meeting of violent Robbers.*

Anſ. But it was a General Council: which it seems then may be such.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the 4th *General Council at* Calcedon.

§ 1. HE begins his Chapter comically, and notably derideth me for saying *Pulcheria* was the same that before at *Ephesus* had set the Bishops against *Nestorius.* Is this so ridiculous? It's well known that Historians make her very powerful with her Brother: she chose his Wife *Eudocia,* (They were long of two minds.) It's no wonder that she that got him condemned at *Ephesus,* got the the same further done at *Calcedon,* when she was Empress her self, having made *Martian* Emperour, and her nominal Husband, (for they were not conjugally to know each other.) Is there any thing in this that deserveth the stage? Though *Theodosius* be reproached by Popish Historians as

as an Eutychian, or a favourer of them, if credible honeſt *Socrates* may be believed, there have been few ſuch Princes in the World, (for Piety, his Houſe was a Church; for Patience, never ſeen angry; for Compaſſion, would never let a man die for Treaſon againſt himſelf.) But his Siſter (a Woman eminent for Wit and Piety) was thought to govern him very much, & ſpecially in the ſeverities againſt *Neſtorius*. *Evagrius* who bitterly reproacheth *Neſtorius*, tells us of ſome writings of his that fell into his hand, in which he ſaith, that the Emperour was his friend, and would not ſign his baniſhment, and laies the cruelties that he underwent on his Officer: and conſidering the caſe of a ſuffering man, I ſee nothing unſeemly in the Letter to him, which *Evagrius* chargeth with contempt.

§ 2. My wiſh for the Churches Peace, that the unskilful words of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches* had been ſilenced by neglect, rather than the flame blown up by honouring them with two General Councils diſputation, doth with this Gentleman deſerve this Replication, [*He cannot be more violent and outragious, more bitter and malicious under all the provocations imaginable, than he is under that neglect which himſelf preſcribeth for the cure.*] *Anſ.* If this be a true accuſer, he can prove what he ſaith: It's eaſie to ſay this of any man: But if a man that hath a cholerick Stomack ſhall ſwear that there was Aloes in his Phyſick, his word is no proof. Theſe are the men into whoſe hands we are by Gods permiſſion falln, while we are caſt out, judged to ſilence, priſons, & beggary, if we do but repeat the words of the Laws and Canons, and in 17 Years time when moſt that they turned out are dead, if the reſt at their own urgent demand do but tell them what they judge unlawful, and anſwer thoſe that accuſe them, they are *outragious*, *violent*, *bitter*, and *malicious*. As if one that wounds me ſhould ſue me for ſaying, *You hurt me*. It's violence and an unpeaceableneſs to feel, but none at all in them to *ſtrike* or to *deſtroy*. We will give you many thanks if you will hurt us no more than we do you.

§ 3. I ſaid that *one skilful healing man that could explicate ambiguous words, and perſuade men to Love and Peace, till they underſtood each other, had more befriended Truth, Piety, and the Church, than the hereticating Councils did.*] And *why*, ſaith he, *may not that skilful man ſhew his skill in Councils, as well as elſe where?*

Anſ. Who denieth it? But the queſtion is, how he ſhall be heard

heard and prevail? I told you that here *One man in one sentence did so*, by differencing between *mental distinguishing* and *dividing*; even *Basil* of *Seleucia*, saying, [*Cognoscimus duas naturas, non dividimus; neque divisas, neque confusas dicimus.*] This was true and plain enough, to have ended all the quarrel: But who laid hold on it, or did improve it? What the better was *Nazianzen* for speaking well in the Council at *Constantinople*? Or *Chrysostome* for any thing he could say to the Bishops for himself? I hope few of all that great number of Councils that were *Arian*, *Semiarian*, *Eutychian*, *Monothelites*, for Images, *&c.* were so bad as to have never a Bishop among them that could or would speak right: But did they prevail? In the very Council at *Trent* were more good Speeches than did prevail; and if *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, *Zuinglius*, and such others, had not done more good singly by Writing and Preaching, than *Dudithius* could do at *Trent*, or any of them at *Wormes*, or *Ratisbone*, &c. there had been little done. What good did *Philpot* do in the Convocation? Some say one *Paphnutius* turned the Inclination of the first *Nicene* Council for good; But that hearing temper was too short or rare.

§ 4. Next he tells us, that [*in many late Disputes of Justification*, &c. *we find not that any of these healing men were able to reconcile Parties any more than the Councils of old.*]

Answ. 1. If that were true, it's also true, that they have not made so great and many Parties as Councils did. We have not cast the world into so many Nations of *Jacobites*, *Nestorians*, and other Sects.

Answ. 2. Through God's mercy it is much better than such Historians would make men believe. Dr. *Heylin* tells us what work the *Arminian* Controversie made between Bishop *Laud*'s Party, and the Parliaments and Abbots Party, as if it had set us all by the Ears. It is not so now: One of your Brethren lately tells us, how that Controversie is quieted: What Contention do you hear of among the Nonconformists about it? No man hath so much as writ a line, that I know of, against my Conciliation in my *Cathol. Theology*. How little stir doth the *Antinomian* Controversie make? If one or two men do vent their displeasure about any of these, we neglect it, and it is presently forgotten. I hear sometime that called Arminianism hotly preached in the Parish Churches: It provoketh not me, and I take no notice

notice of it. I (rarely) hear some preach against the *Arminians*: I take no notice of it, and there it dies: Whereas if one should write Challenges and Accusations to the Preachers, we might make work enough for all the Country. I never yet met with many such, but if you make not a War of it, and engage them by opposition, they grow weary themselves, and grow into unobserv'd neglect or contempt. Most of the spreading Errours and Contentions among us have come by the Bellows of too strong or imprudent Opposition or Disputes. I hear of no considerable Doctrinal Strivings among all the Nonconformists now in *England*. One Ignorant Uncalled Fellow is lately crept into *London*, and wrote proud Challenges for Antinomianism, and none answered him, and he is contemned, and hath no Second that I hear of.

§ 5. Though he say [*he is weary, yet he must not pass by*, that when I mention *Socrates* his most high praise of *Theodosius* (living under him) and the miracles which he saith God wrought for him; I say, *if this be true, God owned his Moderation by Miracles, notwithstanding his favouring the* Eutychians, *more than he did any ways of violence.*] And here the man hath found me in Contradiction, and saith, [*Those miracles could not countenance the* Eutychian *cause that was after.* 2. *That the* Eutychians *were the most violent men.* Such Contradictions he and *L'Estrange* find in my Writings.

Ans. But, 1. Is it true that I said those miracles countenanced the *Eutychian* Cause? I said only that *God owned* the *Moderation* (not the *Eutychian* Opinion) of a man called an *Eutychian* by the Hereticators, notwithstanding his favouring the *Eutychians*. He was a man that studied the reconciliation of the contending Bishops, and was moderate towards all, but persuaded that the major Vote of the Bishops being against *Nestorius*, and for *Cyril*, and *Dioscorus*, it tended to peace to take that side. His Moderation was the same before the stir with *Eutyches* as after. I only said that God by miracles owned that mans moderation, who is charged with after favouring the *Eutychians*.

2. And what I spake of Moderation opposite to violence, in way of suppressing Hereticks, he feigneth me to speak it as opposite to violence in the *Persons suppressed*: I spake of *Violence* in the Prince as agent, and he feigneth me to speak of Violence in the parties that he dealt with. He may find matter at this rate

to write greater Volums against any man. I read of none of the Hereſies then contended about, *Neſtorian* or *Eutychian*, but the accuſed Biſhops were violent for them: But though they were all violent, yet if the queſtion were, whether the Emperour ſhould uſe violence or Moderation againſt them, I may ſay, that God oweth more the way of Moderation.

§ 6. *P.* 246. he ſaith [*At* Epheſus Euſtathius *was kikt to death, and all thoſe that durſt defend him were threatned to be ſerved in like manner.*] *Anſ.* Of this before: His memory failed him: It was not *Euſtathius* but *Flavianus*. 2. Yet he after excuſeth *Dioſcorus* from Hereſie; more Biſhops than were Hereticks were violent.

§ 7. As to his Reflection, ["*It may be he thinks the Empe-*"*rour took a particular Delight in that kind of cruelty, and that* "*he had rather one ſhould be kickt to death, than that he ſhould be* "*hanged or beheaded; which would not be much to the credit of his* "*Moderation*: *And to ſay the truth, his Letter to* Valentinian "*diſcovers a ſtrange kind of Spirit; for there he juſtifies the pro-*"*ceedings of the* Eutychians *at* Epheſus, *and ſaies that all things* "*were carried on with much freedom and perfect Truth, and* Flavi-"an *found guilty of Innovating in Religion. This is but an ill ſign* "*that Mr.* B. *is a hater of falſe Hiſtory, when he lets this paſs un-*"*reproved.*

Anſ. 1. Had I reproved ſuch an Emperour, I might have expected that ſome of you would have publiſhed me an Enemy to Kings.

Anſ. 2. Rather Sir, you and I ſhould hence gather, that all men muſt have pardon and forbearance, and that for want of that, the names of Neſtorians, Jacobites, Melchites, Greeks, Papiſts, Proteſtants, Lutheranes, Calviniſts, Prelatiſts, and Presbyterians, *&c.* have almoſt ſwallowed up the Name, much more the Love of Chriſtians.

Anſ. 3. May it not conſiſt with modeſty and the *hatred* of *falſe Hiſtory*, to believe the high praiſes of this Emperour, publiſhed by one that knew him in ſo pious and credible words as *Socrates* ſpeaks, as I before told you, giving him (to me) a more credible Canonization than the Pope could have done, as a *man of eminent holineſs, wonderful Clemency, that would not let a Traitor go out of the Gates towards the place of Execution; and when he was moved to any Execution, anſwered, he had rather,*

were

were he able, restore the Dead to Life: excelling all the Clergy in meekness, and never seen angry. May not I who am branded for a railer by meek Prelatists, be tolerated to think charitably of such an Emperour, and to wish that the world had many more such.

Ans. 4. Judges are taken for unjust if they will not hear both sides speak. And why should not I regard the words of such an Emperour, as well as of one half the Bishops against the other?

Ans. 5. Surely Modesty requireth me to think that the Emperour was much more capable of knowing the truth of the acts of his own Subjects, when his Servants present gave him an account of them, than I am 1200 Years after: And so good a man would not wilfingly lye.

Ans. 6. Therefore my own Conclusion is, God is true and all men are Lyars, that is, untrusty: and that *Eudocia* and his Courtiers had much power with him for *Dioscorus* against *Flavian*, as *Pulcheria* had against *Nestorius*; but that it was the Peace and Concord of the Bishops which he most studied, and thought that it lay in going with the major part. And I believe things were bad on both sides, and worse than the Emperour thought with the Eutychian Bishops, and worse than others say with their Adversaries; and that the Emperour, though fallible, was as *Socrates* saith, beyond all the Clergie.

But here I see that I am blamed for not railing against a meek and pious Emperour, and as a Railer for lamenting the sins of the Clergie.

§ 8. About the Council of *Calcedon* he accuseth me in general, as [*disingeniously mincing the Acts, and using all the foul play possible.*

Easily said: And what's the proof? Why, 1. Leave out that *they were violently beaten to it.*

Ans. The Reader may see that this is false: I mention it oft, *pag.* 101. [*The Bishops answered, that they did it against their Wills, being under fear: Condemnation and banishment was threatned, Souldiers were there with Clubs and Swords.*] Shall I believe this man against such as *Socrates*, of things done 1200 Years ago, that will face me down with such untruths about my own yet visible Writings?

2. But is it falshood to omit what is said in such and so many Volumns? May not the Reader there see it? Do I contradict it?

Must I write many Folio's or nothing? I refer all Readers to the Acts.

§ 9. But he saith, [*It would go near to excuse their Compliance with a merciful man.*]

Ans. I confess such are not so bad as the Clergy-men, that will sin for meer Preferment, and will write against, and revile, and call for Execution on those that will not do as they. But if Nonconformists after 19 Years Ejection and Reproach, and Sufferings by more than Threats, should at last surrender to heinous sin, can he think it would excuse their Compliance, when Christ saith, *Luk.* 14. 33. *He that forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my Disciple*? If he think Martyrdom a work of Supererogation, he is dangerously mistaken. And he that to day thinks *Threatning* and *Danger* an *Excuse for his sin*, may to morrow think Poverty, and the next day the desire of Preferment an excuse.

§ 10. *Dioscorus* and the *Eutychians* holding close to the Council of *Nice*, as sufficient, as a Test of the Orthodox, to which nothing was to be added, in reciting this he hath found my Ignorance in translating [*retractat*] by [*retract*]. Is not the English word of the same sence with the Latine? If not, and I be ignorant in English too, what wrong is that to any Bishop?

§ 11. When he had charged *Nonsence* and *Confusion* on that which he understood not, and mentioned *Eusib. Doril.* giving the Lye to *Eutyches*, he confesseth that the thing was true.

§ 12. *P.* 253. He saith, *When the giddy rabble of Monks with Swords and staves, like* Bedlams *broke loose, run upon them*---*I should rather pity them than insult.*

Ans. If the History be an insulting, his own credited Historians insult by recording it. If noting it as a fault be insulting, then a motion to Repentance is insulting, and if he would have us pity them for their sin, and not only for their suffering, that is insulting too. But to own their sin, and draw men to imitate them, shall be none of my Compassion.

He minds me of *Peters* Denial, and the Disciples forsaking Christ. Alas! he is not a man that is not sensible of Humane frailty? But is it not therefore to be blamed? Why doth Scripture mention it, but that we may avoid the like? Is it to tempt others to the like? Did Christ insult when he said to *Peter*, *Get thee behind me Satan*, &c.

§ 13. He next falls into his familiar strain, to carry that *ex Cathedra*.

Cathedra, by sentence, which he cannot do by proof, and saith, [*When I venture on Observations it's an even lay that I am out.*] *Ans.* That is, I am out of the way of his Magistry, Preconceipt and Interest.

It is my Conciliatory words that the peaceable man is angry at, *viz.* [*That this doleful, Contentious, Anathematizing, and ruining of each other, was about the sense of ambiguous words, and they were both of one mind in the matter and knew it not.*]: He cannot but confess, that my judgment of them is softer than theirs that hereticate each other. And *Derodon* hath fully proved that this Council when they condemned *Nestorius*, were of his Judgment in the whole matter, and said but the same as he.

§ 14. As to his telling me, that *Eutyches* denied Christ to be truly and properly man, I will no more believe him, than if he had said *Cyril* did so.

§ 15. But he saith, the *Monothelites were the genuine Disciples of* Eutyches. They were of his mind in that Consequence: And such another Controversie it was. And how much greater errour against our Belief of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have I proved *e. g.* to be, in your Dr. *Sherlocks* Book; And yet I hope he meant better than he spake.

§ 16. P. 255. He confesseth of one Party what I said, *viz.* [*"Of* Dioscorus *and* Flavian, *I am apt to believe they were much "of the same Opinion as to the point in controversie, and knew it "well enough; which was the only cause why* Dioscorus *with his "party of Bishops and Monks, would not endure to come to any De- "bate of the matter, for fear it would appear that they all agreed, "and then there would have been no pretence to condemn* Flavian, "*which was the Design, if not of the Emperour, yet at least of those "that governed him.*]

Ans. Fie Dr. will you thus abuse so many Orthodox Bishops? And almost condemn your vindicating Book? And harden me in my Errour? But I am much of your mind, and if one of us err, so doth the other.

§ 17. And I like his Ingenuity, saying *Anatolius* confesseth in Council, that *Dioscorus was not condemned for Heresie but Tyranny, and no man contradicted him. Ans.* Not in answer to those words, but the Accusations of many contradicted him before.

§ 18. That they mean one thing by their various expressions I have

I have fully proved, and he no whit confuteth: That the *Eutychians* acknowledged no distinct *Properties*, and *Nestorius* owned an Unity but in *Dignity* and *Title* only, are his flat slanders, to be no way proved but by their Adversaries accusations. The very words I named even now, [*Divino, mirabili, sublimi nexu.*] and many clearer, shew it of *Nestorius*. And I wish him to take heed himself how he defineth the Hypostatical Union, lest the next General Council (if ever there be one) make him an Heretick.

Can he believe that the great number of *Eutychian* Bishops were so mad, as not to know that Christs Mortality, possibility, material Quantity, Shape, *&c.* were the properties of Christs Humanity and not his Deity? But some Men can believe any thing well or ill, reasonable or unreasonable, as Interest and affection lead them.

§ 19. He saith, that [*If it were a faction that denied this, it was a strong one, and never was opposed by any Person before Mr.* Baxter.

Ans. I heard you were a young man; but if you be not above one Hundred Years old, your reading cannot be great enough to excuse this confidence from such temerity as rendereth you the less credible. How many Thousand Books be they which you or I never read? How know you that none of them all oppose it? But would you persuade the Reader that I call it a Faction, to believe your sence of these Councils? Factious men are forwardest to judge others Hereticks without cause; and all that I say is, that *Though such deny my Assertion it is true*: Doth it follow that I take all for *factious* that deny it? If I had said, [*Though Papists deny it,*] that had not been all one as to say, [*All are Papists that deny it.*]

2. But did never any person oppose it? 1. I named you *David Derodon* before, who though he largely labour to prove *Cyril* an *Eutychian* in words and sence, and that by φύσις he did mean *Natura*, and not *Persona*, yet as to *Nestorius* he copiously proveth, that the Council of *Calcedon* was just of his Mind, and condemned him for want of Understanding him. Though you have not seen that Book of *Derodons*, I have, and you should not judge of what you never saw.

2. *Luther de Conciliis* first accuseth *Nestorius* as a Heretick, denying Christ's Godhead, or holding two Persons; And presently

ly retracts it, and confesseth he was seduced by believing the Papists, but (though he had not read much of the Councils, but what he had gathered out of the *Tripartite* and such Historians) yet he gathered from the Passages of the History, that the difference lay only in words, which he openeth at large, and yet turns it sharply against *Nestorius*, for thinking that we may not speak of Christs Godhead or Manhood by communicated names or Attributes, and greatly rejoiceth that this serveth his turn in his Opinion about Consubstantiation and Sacramental words.

Because I will leave nothing in doubt with you, but whether *Luther* was before my days, and lest you say again that I cite Books which I see not, I will give you some of his words, beginning earlier, (not translating lest I have not skill enough) but they are so like mine, that I doubt you will be no Lutherane.

De Concil. pag. 175. *Ecclesiæ Romana & C. P. ambitiose rixatæ sunt de re nihili, vanissimis & nugacissimis naniis donec tandem utraque horribiliter vastata & deleta est.--- Illa omnia libentius recito, ut videat prudens Lector quomodo ex tam celebri Synodo Constantinopolitana, seu ex fonte manaverint semina maximarum Confusionum, propterea quod ibi Episcopus Ecclesiæ ut Patriarcha fuerat Præfectus.---* p. 178. *Quam horribilia certamina & contentiones moverunt hi duo Episcopi de primatu: ut facile judicari posset, Spiritum sanctum non esse authorem hujus Instituti: Alia habet Episcopus longe potiora quæ agat, quam sunt hi pueriles & inepti ludi--- Præmonemur quod Concilia prorsus nihil novi debent commiscisci vel tradere.*

De Concil. Ephes. p. 180, 181. *Excesserant jam è vivis sancti Patres, & illi optimi Episcopi, S. Ambrosius, S. Martinus, S. Hieronymus, S. Augustinus (qui eo ipso anno quo Synodus coacta est mortuus est) S. Hilarius, S. Eusebius & similes; eorumque loco prorsus dissimiles patres suborti fuerant. Ita ut Imperator Theodosius amplius eligi Episcopum C. P. ex Sacerdotibus vel Clericis Civitatis C. P. nollet: hanc ob causam quod plerumque essent superbi, ambitiosi, morosi, qui movere certamina, & tumultus in Ecclesiis plerumque tolerent.---* p. 182. *Cum jam videret Nestorius tantas turbas ortas ex corruptela multiplici, gemens prorupit in hæc verba,* Tollamus è medio omnes ambiguitates quæ primum præbuerunt occasiones istis certaminibus, & fateamur palam Mariam recte vocari Matrem Dei. *Sed nihil profecit Nestorius, ne tunc quidem*

eum

cum revocaret suum errorem; sed voce publica condemnatus, ex orbe Imperii universo ejectus & explosus est: Quanquam illi duo Episcopi Antiochenus & Alexandrinus, etiam post Concilium cum rediissent in suas Ecclesias, se ipsi mutuis convitiis lacerabant, & omnibus diris devovebant: Etsi postea res ad placidum exitum deducta est: Quanquam tamen dolendum hoc, & effusis lachrymis deplorandum in Ecclesia est, tam præstantes viros adeo indulsisse suis affectibus, ut instar mulierum aut puerorum ineptissime inter se rixarentur. Omnino fuisset eis opus aliquo Constantino, qui ipsorum jurgia & contentiosa scripta etiam conjecisset in ignem.--- p. 184. Mentioning the false accusations of *Nestorius*, making two Persons, &c. [*Atque adeo intricata & confusa sunt quæ scribunt, ut existimem ne quidem ipsos scire in hunc usque diem, quid & propter quas causas damnaverint Nestorium. Hoc inde conjicito. Fatentur credidisse Nestorium quod Christus sit Deus & Homo--- exhis certum est quod Nestorius non crediderit Christum esse purum hominem.--- Constat Nestorium non duos sed unum Christum credidisse, id quod ipsorum verba testantur---ideoque non potuit credere esse duas personas. Nec ullibi reperitur in historiis quod Nestorius unum Christum crediderit habere duas personas, nisi quod Pontifices & eorum historiæ ita argutantur. Apparet Papam & scriptores Pontificios hæc verba contra Nestorium calumniose & veteratorie finxisse, quod Christum pro puro homine & non pro Deo, & quod unum Christum pro duabus personis vel gemino Christo habuerit.--- Nestorius fuit homo inflatus tumens Pharisaico fastu, & indoctus; Et cum subito esset evectus ad supremum fastigium Ecclesiæ, adeo ut haberetur pro summo Pontifice, Patriarcha, somniabat se unum antecellere doctrina & eruditione omnes homines in toto genere humano, nec sibi opus esse lectione librorum qui erant scripti à Majoribus aut aliis, nec in explicatione magnarum rerum retinendos esse modos loquendi antiquitus receptos in Ecclesia puriore; sed quia & voce valebat, & ex temporali facundia volebat esse αυτοδίδακτος, Doctor vel Magister, & formas loquendi quibus ipse uteretur tantum recipiendas esse in Ecclesia, non alias. Et tali fastu armatus adoriebatur illum articulum. Maria est mater Dei, aut genetrix Dei; Ibi vicissim Episcopos in adversa parte invenit perinde inflatos, quibus vehementer displicebat Nestorii fastus, in primis Cyrillum Alexandrinum: quia tunc nullus erat Augustinus aut Ambrosius.*---p. 189. *Hinc manifestum est, quod Nestorius ut homo imprudens & vanissima persuasione adductus, loquatur quidem bono zelo de Christo: sed*

ex

ex mera inscitia non intelligat quid & quomodo loquatur.--- p. 192. *Non est Nestorii error quod Christum credit tantum esse purum hominem, nec in duas personas eum dirimi; sed duas naturas Deum & hominem in una persona uniri fatetur: sed communicationem idiomatum non vult concedere. Objiciat autem hic aliquis, Nestorium insidiose confessum esse, quod Christus Deus sit & una persona. Resp. Quod non: Tam ingeniosus enim & industrius non fuit, sed serio ita judicavit.--- Ad hæc accessit aliorum Episcoporum insolentia, qui non cogitaverunt quomodo sananda essent talia vulnera, sed multo magis irritandis & refricandis causam dederunt. Vide cætera.*

P. 202. De Concil. Calcedon. *Adeo indulgebant sancti Patres mutuis odiis & dissensionibus ut alter non facile vellet alteri cedere*--- shewing the uncertainty of the Histories of this Council, and the Lies of the Papists not to be trusted. *Jam divina qua ratione ego ero salvandus, qui nec ipsum Concilium assequor, nec causam Concilii satis perspicio.* p. 205. *Quod Eutyches non tantum unam in Christo naturam esse statuat, ostendunt Papistarum Verba, qui dicunt Eutychen concessisse in Christo duas naturas,* viz. *Divinitatem & Humanitatem, quæ à Divinitate est assumpta---Sed quid Eutyches voluerit quod postea in Christo tantum Divina natura manserit, deserta humana, ibi prorsus sunt muti; & re nondum certo cognitâ dicunt, statuisse Eutychen quod in Christo duæ naturæ, & tamen non duæ sed una natura sit: Ita postea historiæ fiunt incertæ & obscuræ, ut nemo possit intelligere quid Eutyches senserit, aut quid Pontificiæ historiæ sentiant. Amittimus hisce ambagibus concilium una cum causis propter quas convocatum est.---Ego meas conjecturas recitabo: si rem assequor, bene; si non, non propterea labefactabitur fides Christiana. Eutychis opinio (sicut & Nestorii) errat circa idiomata, quamvis alio modo. Nestorius non vult idiomata humanitatis tribuere Divinitati in Christo:---Contra Eutyches non vult idiomata divinitatis tribuere humanitati, etiamsi & ipse firmiter & mordicus retineat Christum esse verum Deum & hominem. Ut si dicerem in Concione publica, Verbum filium Dei esse conditorem Cœli & Terræ æqualem Patri ab æterno---Et hoc Verbum, illum filium Dei esse verum hominem: Hoc concedit mihi Eutyches nihil dubitans. Jam si porro dicam, Quod ille homo Christus sit conditor cœli & terræ, hoc offendit Eutychen, qui putat prorsus esse absurdum dicere,* Homo creat cœlum & terram.---- P. 210. *Ibi vides quod idiomata facili occasione homines non prænonitos offendant & perturbent. Hic erat subveniendum teneris Conscientiis fraterna, amica & salutari admo-*

 nitione

nitione, nec superbissimi errantes abjiciendi essent. Utinam in eo judicio non respondeat eventus: sed vereor profecto aliquos hæreticos in novissimo die fieri judices; & illos ipsos Episcopos penes quos fuit judicandi potestas, in æternum damnatos, ni Deus est mirabilis & incomprehensibilis in suis judiciis; nisi quod scimus eum esse propitium humilibus & infensissimum superbis. Et præsertim in Conciliis & Ecclesiis nihil erit agendum zelo vel invidia, vel superbia, quia Deus non potest ferre.

§ 20. Readers, you see what tedious work some men can make us: Many are scandalized, as if we gave them false History, if we do not thus confute them; and if we do, we tire our selves and you. If I should cite you many more thus to confute his falshood, that *never person before me opposed that Faction*, you would be weary of it.

§ 21. Yet now my hand is in, you shall see further how much *Luther* was for the same that I have written. [*Qui volet poterit ulterius legere acta Concilii, privata opera. Ego ad tædium & nauseam usq; legi ista; ejusmodi Chaos ceremoniarum & confusionum est ibi, ut videatur recte judicasse Greg. Naz. qui Synodos eruditioribus & sedatioribus interfuit,--- & scribit* [*Sic affectus sum si dicenda est veritas, ut malim omnes Episcoporum conventus vitare, quia nullius Synodi finem vidi bonum, aut qui magis tolleret mala quam augeret. Nam cupiditas contentionis & principatus, & æmulatio vincunt rationem. Ut profecto miror quod propter hæc verba non dudum eum excommunicaverunt ut atrocissimum hæreticum. Sed quid sit quod dicit in Synodis Episcopos certasse ambitione, superbia, φιλονικείᾳ, habes in hac Synodo clarissimum exemplum. Quod autem certum sit quod hic dicit se nullius Synodi vidisse finem bonum, docent nos historiæ: Nam Ariana hæresis jocus fuit ante Nicænum Concilium præ illa confusione quam ipsi post Concilium excitaverunt,* (that was not long of the Synod.) *Talis etiam fuit Macedonici & Nestoriani Concilia: Nam illa pars quæ est condemnata eo fuit conjunctior, ut tali specie concordiæ & unitatis suas præstigias pingerent quasi nulli justa ratione damnari possent. Subinde excitarunt majora certamina contra Concilia quæ ipsi non recte intelligebant.---* P. 247. *Illud possum facillime probare quod miser ille Pastor in Hippone S. Augustinus plus docuit quam omnia Concilia--- Dicam & quiddam amplius: Majus Lumen accedit Doctrinæ Christianæ ex Catechismo puerili quam ex omnibus Conciliis, & oratio Dominica & decem præcepta plus continent doctrinæ & eruditionis quam omnia Concilia.*

§ 22.

§ 21. Becauſe I recite the words of the Biſhops crying *Peccavimus*, he exclaimeth againſt me, as making *Repentance* and *Recantation* a deriſion, and this by the *Spirit of Schiſm which is nice in point of honour, no Conviction ſhall be able to reclaim it, though in the moſt indefenſible thing in the World.*]

Anſ. Add but with the Inquiſitors, [*Therefore burn them as hopeleſs,*] and you are come to the end of your Leſſon. The penetrating Wits of ſome men are admirable. This man whoſe face I never ſaw, knoweth my heart ſo much better than my ſelf and my acquaintance, that he can tell that it is to avoid diſhonour that I avoid Repentance, when I offer him my Oath, that if I have any knowledge of my own deſire, I would thank him as my deareſt Friend, who will by Evidence ſhew me any neceſſary truth that I deny, or Falſhood that I hold, and will joyfully publiſh my recantation.

2. And he can ſee Schiſm in my forbearing known and heinous ſin in the ſatisfaction of my Conſcience, while I write, and preach, and practiſe Communion with their Church, and can ſee none in ſilencing Thouſands, and *ipſo facto* excommunicating many more Thouſands of godly Chriſtians, and denying Baptiſm and the Lords Supper to ſuch as think it is ſinful to do---- he knows what.

3. And he can ſee thoſe things to be moſt indefenſible, which after our beſt ſtudy we take to be clear, and can get no rational Reply to our defence.

4. And (for want of memory or tenderneſs of his partners veracity) when their Advocates have ſo oft and ſcornfully charged me with *Retractations*, and alſo told the World how much my own party (as they call them) ſpeak againſt me, and my many large and free oppoſitions to the faults of Nonconformiſts that run into any extream, do all proclaim how little I have ſet by ſuch honour; yea, when himſelf ſaith that I have fiercely contended againſt all Sects and Parties, and they call me *Iſhmael*, whoſe hand is againſt every man: After all this to proclaim as aforeſaid, ſuch obſtinate Impenitence for the love of Honour, I confeſs doth no more further my conviction than the Oath of an Iriſh Witneſs would have done: For if he had ſworn it, I would have ſhewed my Books and their contrary teſtimony, and have askt him, whoſe honouring of me is it that I buy ſo dearly? It is not the Rulers, nor the Prelates, nor their Clergy,

nor their adherents, noble or ignoble: And if I have willingly and laboriously displeased and lost the Sectaries too, whose honour is it that I sell my Soul for?

§ 23. But did the man think that *Unconstancy* and *compliance with* powerful Heresie, is the same thing with Repentance for it? Or is it well done to persuade the Reader that it is Repentance or Retractation of Heresie I write against, when I recite the words of the Council and their own? Do I say that *peccavimus* was their sin?

§ 24. And I would humbly desire him in time to consider, 1. Whether it was a venial sin not to be named by me, when the most zealous Papists and Historians name it, for so great a number of Bishops to turn and turn again so often, and that with Anathematizing one year of what they voted for before with Anathema to the contrary. I crave your impartial consideration but of two Instances: How oft did they with Anathema's vote for and against the Council of *Calcedon* as the Emperours changed? Yea in the same Usurpers time, *Basiliscus*, when he changed himself. 2. In the case of Images: How oft did they change in Councils, for them and against them, as the Princes changed? Sir, we mind this with lamentation and not insultingly: But if you take these for venial little sins, and our not swearing and covenanting all that you bid us for a mortal sin, are you not partial?

2. And I would wish you to think on it again, before you make this guilt your own, by mincing and excusing it; and lest you make all other mens sin your own, whom hereby you encourage in the imitation of them. These are not things indifferent.

3. And do not so dishonour Prelacy, and your Church and Discipline, as to tell the World that these in Bishops are little things; what then is left for you to stick at? No man should make light of such Beams in the Eyes of those that should be the most pure, while they are pulling the mote of scrupling a Ceremony, yea an Oath. *&c.* from their Brothers Eye, and that by such Iron Instruments as they use.

§ 25. Next comes his Logical terms, [*throwing dirt, outragious, bitter, malicious*, &c.] And what's the matter? [*I give not one loose at Emperours and Courts: scorning to change the game, charging the Bishops with the faults of the Magistrate, and laying all*

all the blame on them.] In what words? I say, [*so far could fierce, and factious Prelates prevail with a pious and peaceable Prince, by the pretences of opposing Heresie and Schism.*

Ans. 1. Was he not a most pious and peaceable Prince? Then *Socrates* that knew him, and protesteth against flattery, and many others, are not to be believed? yea, if he excelled not the Bishops?

2. Do I say that none but the Bishops perswaded him? Where do I lay all the fault on them? Do I not after name the Empress *Eudocia*, as the Agent to perswade him for the Eutychians, and *Pulcheria* to perswade him against *Nestorius*: My words are visible.

3. What Bishops were they that perswaded him to make a Law to confirm the *Ephesine*, Eutychian Council? Was it not *Dioscorus* and the Eutychians? Were they not Bishops? Did they not do it? Yea, doth not this man oft revile them far more bitterly than ever I did, and revile me for speaking so charitably of them? Would you ever have expected that the same man should have so reviled me, for saying that these Eutychian Bishops prevailed with a good Emperour to confirm that Council of Eutychians?

4. Is it a sin not to speak hardlier of so good a Prince, who after repented and punished his Wife and Eunuch for perswading him? It was a blaming him to tell to what he was perswaded.

Truly the mans anger here for my blaming the Eutychian Bishops, in condemnation of whom he hath poured out so much more than I, doth make me think that there is somewhat in the sound of some words, that turns his wrath this way or that: When he hears the name of an Eutychian, *away with them, speak not easily of them.* When the same men are called Bishops, it's *malice, outragious bitterness* to blame them for getting a Law to confirm that called an Heretical, Murdering, Latrocinian Council. His words are, p. 146. [*Were there ever greater violences committed than in that infamous Conventicle at* Ephesus?]

§ 26. P. 263. He confesseth that the *Debate between the Council and the Egyptian Bishops was something too warm*: but saith *that heat was not altogether without reason. Ans.* This is his way to confess their faults, and then rail at me for bare reciting the words of the Debate or History. But it *was not without reason*: He confesseth

confeſſeth not ſo much as this of the ſilencing and ruining Miniſters now. It ſhall not be the uſe of my reaſon to make Figleaves to cloath and cover the ſins which God abhorreth.

Men will be men he ſaith, wherever they are placed, whether in a Council or in the Church, or even at the Altar.

Anſ. By *Men* I ſuppoſe he meaneth Sinners: and it's true. But of all Sinners Oh that God would ſave his Church from thoſe who hate reproof, and cheriſh the worſt that will be for them, and excommunicate and proſecute the moſt conſcionable that will not obey them in things which they call indifferent, for fear of ſinning againſt God.

§ 27. His trifling words about *Leo* and *Rome* are not worthy of an Anſwer.

§ 28. He hath, P. 268. hit again on the overſight which I before confeſſed, even the effect of my neceſſitated haſte, that in tranſlating *Theodoret*'s words I put (*truly*) in the wrong place: I ask him forgiveneſs, and the Biſhops, if that be any ſlander againſt them; which is nothing to them.

§ 29. He ſaith, P. 269. [*There is no truth in what our Author ſaith, that* Ibas *Epiſtle was acquit.*] *Anſ.* There is no truth in ſaying that I ſaid it was, when my words were disjunctive, [*The Epiſtle was acquit, or at leaſt the Biſhop upon the reading of it.*] He ſaith, *Ibas was not acquit on the reading the Epiſtle, but on the defence he made, that he communicated with* Cyril. *Anſ.* His Accuſations of Falſhood are commonly Boyiſh Quibbles. His Defence and the Reading of his Letter go together, and in *Binnius* the Letter, and the Letters of the Clergy of *Edeſſa* are the laſt things done before he is diſcharged.

§ 30. P. 270. He ſaith, [*The truth is, the* Eaſtern *Biſhops were not ſo ingenuous and fair after their reconciliation with* Cyril, *&c.*] Thus he becomes himſelf ſtill an accuſer of the Biſhops.

§ 31. Becauſe I ſay that the Judges paſt ſentence to caſt out both *Stephen* and *Baſſian* from *Epheſus*, and *all conſented*, he ſaith, [*One would think here the Judges paſſed ſentence againſt the conſent or Inclination of the Biſhops.*] *Anſ.* There is no end of anſwering your *thinkings*. I did not ſay that the Judges paſſed the Councils Sentence but their own: And whether it were againſt the *Fore-inclination* of the Council let any Reader judge, when the Judges asking the Council their ſence, [*Rei, Epiſcopi clamaverunt, juſtitia Baſſianum vocat: Regulæ valeant.* The

Judges

Judges answered them that their judgment was that both were to be cast out, and a third chosen, and the Council suddenly consented. If he would be believed conrradicting this he must deny the Acts.

§ 32. He hath found matter for a quibble against *tasting* Poterius *Flesh with their Teeth.* Teeth taste not: Dangerous false History, or want of Learning is learnedly here discovered. When he cannot deny the most woeful, calamitous dissentions which followed the *Calcedon* Council, he saith, [*Was it the misfortune or the fault of these only not to be able to heal the differences of the Church? Or was the defect in the Councils, or the blame to be imputed to those obstinate men that opposed the Rule established by them?*]

Ans. No: They were neither the first nor the last that have miscarried. Nor are we the first that suffer under such miscarriage. It was the misfortune of the Churches to have such Physicians: But as it is the honour of some Physicians to shew how many Patients they have cured, so is it of some others, when most die under their hands, to be able to say, that it was long of the Patients that would not be ruled, or that they killed them *secundum artem.* It was a Proverb in *Sutton-Coldfield,* [*Who begun?*] A poor man had but one Ass and he loaded him too hard, and the Ass being in pain bit his Master a little on the Buttock; and his Master knockt him down, and killed him; and when he saw him dying, , [*Well,* (saith he) *But who begun?*] But who had the loss? There be Clergy-Men that can impenitently see the *Strages,* the divisions, the swarms of sin that are the consequents of their needless masterly Impositions, and wipe their mouths and say, It was the obstinacy of those that would not be ruled by us! They kill a Flea on a mans Forehead with a Beetle, and say they meant not to kill the man.

But if that Councils Acts were a fit means to cure the Churches Divisions, how came they to be presently and through many Ages, yea, ever since to this day, thereby increased so many fold? Though the Assembly at *Jerusalem* cured not all the Jewish Teachers of their blind Zeal for *Moses* Law, it was so far from increasing the Dissentions and number of Dissenters, that it satisfied the Gentile Christians for the most part, and many of the Jewish, and greatly diminished the Discord. It's one thing *not wholly to cure,* and another to *make far worse.*

§ 33.

§ 33. He instanceth also in the *Dort Synod that made things worse.*

Ans. 1. The Synod of *Dort* made things the worse in their own Country, not by their *Doctrinal Decisions*, but by too much of the *Masterly Spirit*, engaging the Magistrates against the *Arminians* in the use of the Sword. Whether it be true that they say, that they were necessitated to do what they did against *Barnevelt* and *Grotius* for the safety of their State, I am no Judge: But I am sure it is of an ill sound to those that read it: And so is it to read in *Episcopius* and others, what violence the People have used against the *Arminians*, and they were fain to tolerate them when all was done.

And it's no wonder that the Dissention increased in *England*, when the Clergy would not long stand to the decrees that by our own six Delegates were moderated: Dr. *Heylin* tells you how Bishop *Laud's* Zeal was the cause of our following Contentions: And how? By bearing down all that were against him.

2. But the meer *Doctrinal Decrees* of the Synod of *Dort* are so moderate and healing, that where Violence hath been forborn, and Reason used, many have been pacified by them. And

3. What that Synod did not, a few private Peace-makers have much done: The Writings of *Camero Amyraldus*, *Capellus*, *Placeus*, *Testardus*, *Lud. Crocius*, *Mat. Martinius*, *Conr. Bergius*, *Joh. Bergius*, *Blondel*, *Daile*, and above all, *Le Blanc's* have for ought I hear, half ended the controversie. And having my self written one Book (*Cathol. Theologie*) for Reconciliation, I have not to this day had a word of Contradiction, but the Consent of very many. And as I before noted, Is not even in *London* where other differences might exasperate, yet this Controversie almost laid to sleep? But if our *Arminians* will but get as severe Laws and Canons made against them that are not of their Opinions, as be against them that dare not conform to the Diocesane Model and the rest, they shall quickly see this quarrel revived. The Articles of the Church of *England* determine not these Controversies, and that is our Peace. Put in but one determining Article against either side, and it will break us more in pieces. Doth not our own Case and Experience then confute those over-doing Councils?

§ 34. His next Instance is that of the *Westminster* Assembly,--- *So far from reconciling the People, that after this they were distracted*

ſtracted into innumerable Schiſms: Never was there ſo lamentable a face of things, never ſuch variety of Hereſies, and ſuch Wantonneſs, and Extravagancy, in blaſpheming God under pretence of Religion and Conſcience: And this is the State whither the ſame manner of men are driving again.

Anſ. 1. I ſay again I knew ſo many of that Aſſembly, as that I do not think that the Chriſtian World had ever an Aſſembly of more able and truly pious Clergy-Men, theſe 1300 Years at leaſt. But theſe Upſtarts that knew them not can tell us any thing that Faction hath taught them to believe concerning them and others. The Parliament was by ſeeming neceſſity drawn to gratifie the Scots: The Aſſembly, though Conformiſts, all, ſave Eight or Nine, were as ſenſible as the Nonconformiſts of the miſchiefs of ſilencing worthy Miniſters, and forbidding Afternoon Sermons, and ſuch like; and they were as much againſt Arminianiſm and Popery as the Church of *England* was in A.Bp. *Abbat*'s days, and as much as he againſt the Doctrine of *Mainwaring* and *Sibthorp*: And the Parliament abſolutely reſtrained them from debating any thing but what they propoſed to them; ſo that they that were for the Primitive Epiſcopacy had no liberty to debate it, or ſpeak for it, but on the by. But when the Covenant was offered them againſt Prelacy, they were about to enter a Proteſtation againſt it, and were ſtopt only by limiting the renunciation to the Engliſh frame deſcribed in an explicatory Parentheſis. But for my part I think them much to be blamed, that they did not, though againſt that prohibition, reſolve to propoſe ſuch moderate healing terms to the Parliament as were agreeable to their judgments, or at leaſt have teſtified againſt the limiting of Church Concord to ſuch narrow termes, as muſt exclude ſuch men as were for the Engliſh Epiſcopacy: They might eaſily have known, that the number of ſuch in *England* was ſo great, as that an excluding Law muſt needs be an Engine of great Diviſion; and that Conqueſt will not change mens Judgments.

And as I doubt not but the five Diſſenting Independents were greatly to blame, for making ſuch a ſtir for leave to gather their Churches, when nothing was impoſed on them which they could accuſe; So I doubt not but the Aſſembly were to be blamed for making a greater noiſe againſt errours than they had cauſe for. Their deſire of Concord, which was good itſelf, did raiſe

them to too great Expectations of it, and too great impatience of little differences. They publiſhed their Teſtimony againſt the errours of the times, in which they took in Dr. *Hammond*, and made many differences worſe than they were, too like the old Hereticators. And they wanted that skill to compoſe their differences with the Independents, as was needful to that end, and might have been attained. And will the faults of that Aſſembly juſtifie the far greater faults of others? But

2. This ſort of Hiſtorians do much more differ from us about the matters of Fact, which our Eyes have dayly ſeen, yea, about our own Thoughts and Minds, than about the Hiſtory of the ancient Church. The caſe was very far different from that which he deſcribeth. Mr. *Lawſon*, a Conformiſt, ſaith, [There was never better Preaching, Piety encouraged and encreaſed, *&c.* than at that time. In all the Counties where I was acquainted, there were many young Orthodox faithful Preachers, that gave themſelves wholly to do good, for one that was ten Years before, and not any conſiderable number noted for any immorality: We were in the County where I lived almoſt all of one mind; for Epiſcopal, Presbyterians and Independents uniting in that which they agreed in, and leaving all to Liberty in the reſt, we lived in conſtant Brotherly Love and Peace without Diſſention. I never knew of any of a divers Religion in all the County, ſave at the end, in one or two corners about Twenty Quakers: And near me were about Twenty otherwiſe Orthodox, that denied Infant-Baptiſm, (and perhaps as many more in the whole County,) and Two or Three ignorant Socinians. In the next County I heard not of ſo many Heterodox: Never did I ſee, before or ſince, ſo much Love and Concord among Miniſters, and all religious People, nor read of any Age that had ſo much for 1300 Years. And whereas the common cry is, Oh, but they were all Rebels againſt the King! I have named abundance of the Miniſters in mine Apology to Dr. *Good*, (who being Epiſcopal was a Guide in our Meetings, and after ſo accuſed the Nonconformiſts) and challenged him to name one of them that ever meddled with Wars. I knew none in all the County that was in any Army ſave the King's, ſave Mr. *Hopkins* of *Eveſham* (dead) and my ſelf, and one that is a Conformiſt, and one Independent (dead.)

But it's true, that they were then ſo ſet upon Pariſh Reformation and Concord, that they were more troubled at any one that

that did turn Quaker, or againſt Infant Baptiſm, than ſome indifferent Perſons are at Multitudes. And I was one that diſputed moſt againſt them, and wrote againſt ſome diſtant Antinomians, moſtly Souldiers; But our Diſputes ſatisfied and confirmed all our Neighbours more than Priſons would have done. We puniſhed none of them, and none of our People there turned to them. But I confeſs we were commonly too little ſenſible, how much hurtful Violence hindereth Concord, more than loving forbearance of tolerable differences. As too many were how much for Peace they ſhould have abated of the Zeal for their private Opinions, which they thought to be better than they were. We were much like the days that followed the Apoſtles, which had ſome troubleſome Sectaries, but the main Body of Chriſtians did cleave together in Love, till ſucceſs had puft up a *rebellious Army* to make themſelves Rulers, to the Confuſion of themſelves and others.

§ 35. At laſt mentioning the common Diſſentions of the Churches, he ſeems to reſolve the Queſtion, *What then muſt be done?* But he puts us off only with the Negative Anſwer, that [*the Rule, i. e.* of our Uniformity *is not to be altered.* And why? [*We have no aſſurance that we ſhall find any Conformity to it more than we have now.*]

Anſ. I muſt not call this Anſwer as it deſerveth.

1. You were about dealing otherwiſe with the Papiſts: Dr. *Heylin* tells us how much they were to have altered for Concord: Mr. *Thorndike* threatens the Land, if you alter not the Oath of Supremacy for them: The name of the Pope and Anti-Chriſt hath been expunged for them; yet you ſaid not, *We know not that they will come any nearer us.*

2. By theſe meaſures a Rag or a Ceremony ſhould never be abated for the Peace and Concord of any Church or Kingdom: You may ſtill ſay we are not ſure that this will ſerve them. The Pope may ſay ſo, where he refuſeth to abate the ſhaving of the Prieſts Beards, or the leaſt of his Impoſitions; yea he knows that would not ſerve. They ſaid ſo to the *Bohemians* four Demands: They concluded ſo at firſt againſt *Luther*. This very Argument hath kept them from all Reformation.

3. Can you find nothing in your Impoſitions that in the nature of the thing is worthy to be altered? If not, you have more or leſs Wiſdom than Biſhop *Morton*, and the reſt of the Church

Doctors who at *Westminster* motioned so many Alterations. If one should but then move you to correct your known false Rule for finding *Easterday*, or to give Parents leave to be the first Promisers for their own Children, and Godfathers but their seconds, or not to deny Christendom and Communion for that or a Ceremony: No, come on it what will, nothing must be altered, lest men ask more. And yet you preach against Clergy Infallibility, (or subscribe at least.)

4. But if you are so much against altering, why did you alter to our greater suffering, and add as much more (yea five times more) to the former Task and Burden? You can no doubt say somewhat for all this.

5. And when it is the same things that the old Nonconformists still asked, and we since 1660 askt yet less, what reason had you to raise that suspicion that we will not be satisfied with what we ask? Have we given you any cause? If you mean that perhaps there be some still that may be unsatisfied, will you deny Peace to so many that beg it of you, because others will not accept it on their Terms? Or will you never agree with any lest some disagreement should arise hereafter.

Some Travellers were assaulted by the high way by a Captain of Souldiers, who took all their Money, Swords and Horses, and swore he would kill them if they would not take an Oath to conceal him: One took the Oath to save his Life, another scrupled it: They begg'd his Mercy to restore so much as would bring them home: He askt them what would satisfie them: One would have his Horse, another his Sword, another part of his Money. He told them, *You are a Company of Rogues, that can neither agree what to ask, nor give me assurance if I give you this you will ask no more.* I compare not the Authority but the Reasons of the Denial.

§ 36. But seeing no abatement of their Canons, *&c.* must be granted, what is it that must cause our Concord? He would not tell you; but it's discernible what's left: It must be *no Concord* but what Punishment can procure: And what punishment? Sharper than is yet tried; for that hath not done it: Such Concord as *Tertullian* nameth, *Solitudinem faciunt & pacem vocant*: The Concord in *Spain* is worse than the *Amsterdam* toleration.

Again I remember the great Fish-Pond mentioned by Judge *Hale*, that had multitudes of Fish and frie; and at last two small

ſmall Pikes put in; when the Pond was drawn there was never a Fiſh but the two Tyrants (as he calls them) grown to a huge bigneſs. The fear leaſt *Popery* and *Prelacy* ſhould be the two Pikes, tempted men irregularly to covenant againſt them. To have ſuch variety as Roch, Dace, Pierch, Tench, Carp, made it a Schiſmatical Pond; The two Pikes were againſt Schiſm and Toleration, and for ending the Diviſion by reducing all to unity of Species.

§ 37. As to his Queſtion of Qu. *Elizabeths* days, the Intimation may ſeduce the ignorant, but none elſe. 1. If he know not that it was the Subſcription required in the Canons, (that *nothing in the Books is contrary to the Word of God*, ſcrupled, which broke the Peace and Concord of *England*, he is unfit by his Ignorance to be an Informer of others. I have known many that would have yielded to come into the Conforming Church, if *that one word* had been but forborn: For when any practice againſt their Conſciences about baptizing, Communion, or Burials had faln in their way, they would have ſilently ſhifted it off, or been from home, and have ventured to anſwer it, ſo they could but conſcionably have got in. But our Canoneers are for all or nothing.

2. He is ſure no Engliſh Clergy-man, if he know not how much is laid on us, that was not known in the days of Qu. *Elizabeth*. Is it to inform men, or deceive them, that he makes the difference to be between 36 and 39 Articles, and ſaith nothing of all the new Covenants, Declarations, Oaths, Subſcriptions, Doctrine and Practiſes?

§ 38. Many make uſe of Mr. *Edwards Gangrena*, and *the London Miniſters Teſtimony againſt errours*, to prove the Hereſies and Confuſions of the late times. No doubt all ſin is odious: But few men living are more competent Witneſſes of thoſe things than I. The Errours that ſprung up were much more tenderly reſented then than now. You now have many called Wits and Perſons of Quality, who at a Club diſpute againſt the Providence of God, the immortality of the Soul, and a future Life; and there is neither Church-Admonition, Excommunication, nor any great matter made of it, but they are Members of the Church of *England*, the pureſt Church in all the World: Whereas in thoſe licentious times, if one Souldier had ſpoken ſuch a Word, it would have rung out through the Land, and perhaps his Tongue would have

have been bored with an hot Iron. It was the errours of proud rebellious Soldiers that made moſt of the noiſe, that had no conſiderable number of Miniſters left with them. I had a hand in Mr. *Edwards* Book thus: An Aſſembly of Miniſters after *Naſeby* Fight ſent me into the Army to try if I could reduce them. Dayly diſputing with them, a few proud ſelfconceited Fellows vented ſome groſs words. At *Amerſham* a few Country Sectaries had ſet up a Meeting in Dr. *Crooks* Church, to diſpute and deceive the People: A few of Major *Bethel's* Troop (that afterwards turned Levellers and were ruined) joined with them: I met them, and almoſt all day diſputed againſt them, and ſhamed them, and they met there no more. I gathered up all the groſs words which they uttered and wrote them in a Letter to *Francis Tyton*, and after I found them cited in Mr. *Edwards Gangrena*. And what's the abſurd Speeches of a few ignorant Souldiers, that are dead with them, to the Hereſies and Schiſms that theſe 1000 or 1200 Years continue in all the Roman Communion, and they ſay in all the reſt of the Chriſtian World. One cheating Papiſt as a converted Jew got into an Anabaptiſts Meeting, one *Maxwell* a *Scot*, and all *England* rung of it. But when Biſhops have made and keep *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, &c. in the ſame Errours, Dr. *Heylin*, and Bp. *Bromhall*, and ſuch others, took them for ſuch, with whom a Coalition on the terms by them deſcribed was very deſirable.

CHAP. XXIV.

His 7th Chapter conſidered.

§ 1. THE Man had not the courage to defend the ſurgent Prelacy in its Manhood and Maturity, but only in its Infant and Juvenile State; nor to defend the many hundred Councils which I mentioned after the Council of *Calcedon*, in which either his Modeſty or Cautelouſneſs comes ſhort of his Rd. Fathers, who ſome of them own the ſix firſt General Councils, and ſome of them eight, and ſome would unite with the Church of *Rome*, if they will abate but the laſt 400 Years additions.

§ 2. In

§ 2. In his Gleanings in this 7th Chap. he over, and over, and over perſuadeth his Reader, that I make or affirm that [*the Bps. were the cauſe of all the Hereſies in the world, and of all the Hereſies, Schiſms, and Evils that have afflicted the Church.* And hath this Hiſtorian any proof of this? Or is it the melancholy fiction of his Brain? Yes, this is his proof contrary to my manifold Inſtances, becauſe I ſay in one age, [*We have a ſtrange thing, a Hereſie raiſed by one that was no Biſhop*: which I have anſwered before. To be *then ſtrange*, and *never to be at all*; are not words of the ſame ſenſe? But his Anſwers throughout do mind me of *Seneca*'s Words, that a man that is ſore complains (or cries Oh) when he doth but think you touch him.

§ 3. He thus himſelf accuſeth the Biſhops, *p.* 276. [*There have been wicked men and wicked Biſhops in all times.*] And p. 277. [*That ſome Biſhops have abuſed their Authority and Office, and been the cauſe of Hereſie and Schiſm cannot be denied.*] But yet [*He hath ſhewed ſufficiently, that moſt of my particular Accuſations are void of all truth and Ingenuity.*] *Anſ.* Or elſe thoſe words are ſo.

§ 4. He ſaith *All Eccleſiaſtical Writers agree, that* Simon Magus *was Author of the firſt Hereſie in Chriſtian Religion.*] *Anſ.* All confeſs that *Judas* was before him: And if it be a Hereſie to buy the Spirit for Money, it is a Hereſie to ſell Chriſt for Money. But I confeſs ſome tell us of his after pranks at *Rome*, and imitating *Icarus*, at *Peters* Prayers: If you would ſee why Dr. *More* takes this for a toyiſh Legend, ſee his *Myſtery of Iniquity*, Lib. 2. C. 19. § 6, 7. p. 447, 448.

§ 5. P. 286, 287. *Baronius* firſt, and *Philaſtrius* after, are made guilty of Forgery and diſregardable Hiſtory, ſo that I may well bear ſome of his Cenſures.

§ 6. P. 290. To confute me effectually he ſaith much what the ſame which is much of the ſum of all my Book: And yet it's falſe and malicious in me, and true and charitable in him: *viz.* [*Praiſing the firſt* 300 *years*, (when the Biſhops were ſuch as we offer to ſubmit to:) he adds [*The following Ages were not ſo happy; but as Chriſtians generally degenerated ſo did the Biſhops too.*]

Anſ. What! Before the Council of *Nice!* That's a ſad Confeſſion. I was ready to ſay as a Roman Emperour ſaid to a flatterer, that ſtill ſaid all that he ſaid, [*Dic aliud aliquid ut duo ſimus,*]

mus,] But his next words allay it, [*But yet not so much as our Author would make it appear.*] As the Dominicans and Oratorians must say some falshood of *Calvine*, lest they be thought Calvinists.

And yet he addeth, [*The beginning of the 4th Century was very unhappy to the Church, for Persecution without, and Heresie and Schism within.* Meletius *an Egyptian began a Schism, forsook the Communion of the Church,* &c. *Next the Donatists, Arians,* &c.]

Ans. It seems that the Emperours *Constantius* and *Valens were without the Church, and yet the Arian Priests and Bishops were within it.* When he defineth the Church we may understand this. But is it not this 4th Century that is made the Churches more flourishing state by others?

§ 7. Even the great Historian of Heresies, *Epiphanius*, is said p. 292. to be [*unaccountably mistaken in several things relating to that History.*] And 293. hath [*a strange unaccountable mistake in diverse other things relating to that matter.*] If I had at any time erred with such a Bishop and Father, I might have been excusable for reciting his History.

§ 8. Pag. 295. He opens the very Heart of his Parties Principles, and saith, [*The Church is never distracted more by any thing than Projects of Moderation.*]

Ans. Experience proveth that you speak your Heart. The words are no wilful Lye which agree with a mans Mind, be they never so false as disagreeable to the matter. No man was more of that Opinion than *Hildebrand*, that would not yield the Emperours the Investiture, nor as I before said, abate the Prince of *Calaris* the shaving of his Bishops Beard to save his Kingdom. *Victor* began with that Opinion too soon, but his Successors have these Thousand Years been as much for it as you can wish.

2. But to whom is it that you intend this? Sure not to all: Was Bishop *Laud* of that mind toward the Papists if Dr. *Heylin* say true? Was *Grotius* of that mind toward them? Was Arch-Bishop *Bromhall*, *Forbes*, *Bezian*, *Thorndike* (and many more such) of that mind? No: I'le excuse you, that you meant not them and their *Projects* of *Moderation*: Nor I believe neither *Cassander's*, *Erasmus's*, *Wicelius's*, *Sancta Clara's*, *Leander's*, &c.

But towards such as I am, you have been as firm to that Principle as any one of our Enemies could wish. In 1660, 1661. it

was

was most effectually improved; and you have attained much of the fruits then foretold: and ever since have been unmoveably and prevailingly true to it.

3. But this maketh some men the *Distracters of the Church*, if not the *greatest*, which truly I have better thoughts of: Such as *Junius*, *Paræus*, *Amyraldus*, *Le Blanke*, *Davenant*, *Ward*, *Usher*, *Holdsworth*, *Morton*, *Hall*, &c. And lately when we were preparing for the Kings Return, Bp. *Brownrig*, and after his death Dr. *Gawden*, Dr. *Gulston*, Dr. *Allen*, Dr. *Bernard*, and diverse such did offer themselves to a Treaty for Moderation: And since then Dr. *Wilkins*, Dr. *Burton*, Dr. *Tillotson*, and *in diebus illis* Dr. *Stillingfleet* have been guilty of this crime, of *distracting the Church by projects* of Moderation: But I can name the Bps. that were not guilty of it.

To abate or forsake the necessary points of Faith and Practice on pretence of Moderation, is to destroy Christianity on pretence of Humanity or Peace. But to make Laws that men shall preach with Horns on their Heads, to signifie the Victory of Truth, and to ruine all that will not keep these Laws (much more if men should command worse) and to say a Project for Moderation would distract the Church, would be as far from Wisdom as it is from Moderation: And some Prelates have done as bad as this.

§ 9. He confesseth *p.* 296. that by force and Fraud [*the whole World in a manner was turned Arian.*] And did I ever say worse of the Bishops than this?

§ 10. He maketh *Aerius* to speak against Bishops because he could not be a Bishop, so that he was of a Prelatical Judgment and Spirit, and calleth him [*The Cartwright of the times,*] by which if he mean that Cartwright would have been a Bishop, it doth but tell us that he deserveth little belief in his History.

§ 11. He is a most singular Historian, *p.* 303. in telling us, that after the Monothelites *in following Ages of the Church the Devil started up but few Heresies till these Ages,*--- *Swenkfeldians*, *Anabaptists*, &c.

By this I perceive he believeth neither Papists nor Protestants: For the Papists name many Heresies since, and the Protestants say that Popery is but a Composition of many Heresies, and name us many that concur'd thereto.

§ 12. He there giveth me this ſerious Admonition, [*It is a much greater wonder that any man that makes Conſcience of what he ſaith, ſhould againſt all truth of Hiſtory, and againſt his own knowledge, charge the Biſhops with all the Hereſies in the World: that a perſon that ſeems ſo ſenſible of approaching Judgment, as frequently to put himſelf in mind of it---ſhould yet advance ſo malicious and groundleſs an Accuſation. There is no dallying with the all-ſeeing God---What Plea ſhall be made for whole Books full of Calumny and Detraction,* &c.]

Anſ. This is not the leaſt acceptable paſſage to me in his Book; I love the man the better for ſeeming ſerious in the belief of Judgment; and I hope his Warning ſhall make me ſearch my Heart with ſome more jealouſie and care. He ſeems here to believe himſelf; but being my ſelf far more concerned than he is to know how far I am guilty of what I am accuſed, as far as I can know my Heart and Writings, I'le tell the Reader what to judge of his words and me.

1. That I *charge the Biſhops with all the Hereſies in the World*, never was in my mind, nor can I find it in any of my Writings: Yet this he very oft repeateth: And ſhould a man ſo often write a falſhood about a thing viſible, and never cite the place where I ſay it, and this while he is thus ſeriouſly mentioning *Calumny* and *Judgment*.

2. Can he make men believe at once that I do perſuade men that Biſhops or Dioceſanes came not up till about 150 years after Chriſt, and yet that I make them the Authors of the Hereſies that were in thoſe times? *Non entis non eſt actio*: Could Biſhops be Hereticks when there were no Biſhops?

3. If I had *charged the Biſhops with all the Hereſies*, it followeth not that I had charged no one elſe with them, and made the Biſhops the ſole Authors, and acquit People, Prieſts, and Princes; why then doth he name many Monks and Prieſts that were Hereticks? Or Emperours that promoted them, as if this croſſed what I ſay? Did he think that I excluded the Army if I blame the General, or the Prelatical Prieſts when I blame the Prelates? If I took the Biſhops of *England* to be the chief cauſe of our Church-Schiſms, and Calamities, doth it follow that I acquit ſuch as you, and all the Clergy like you?

4. That I have done this [*againſt all Truth of Hiſtory*] which I tranſcribed out of the Councils and Hiſtorians moſt partial for the

the higheſt Prelacie, is either a great untruth, and unproved by him, or I know not what I read or write.

5. That I do this againſt my own Knowledge I am certain is an untruth.

6. That my Accuſations are *malicious* I am *certain* is untruth, as being able to ſay that I ſpeak in pitty to the Church, and to ſave Souls from deceit, and malice no man; but pray with the Liturgy, that God will *forgive our Enemies, Perſecutors, and Slanderers, and turn their Hearts.*

7. That I have brought any *Groundleſs Accuſation* I muſt take for an untruth, till my Grounds produced are better confuted.

8. Much more that I write *whole Books full of Calumny and Detraction.*

All theſe and more untruths being heapt up with the mention of Death and Judgment, tells us whither Faction and Prepoſſeſſion may carry men.

2. But what is the truth I ſhall again briefly tell the Reader: 1. About 2000 of ſuch Miniſters as I confidently take for the moſt ſpiritual, and conſcionable and devoted to God and the good of Souls are ſilenced, and in Law impriſoned and ruined; and all the People of their mind are *ipſo facto* (if they confeſs it) excommunicated, beſides their other penalties. I accuſe not the Law but mention only the matter of Fact, which the K. once commiſſioned Bps. to have prevented.

2. The Kingdom is dolefully divided, and alas, the ſad conſequents are not to be named.

3. Beſides all our Penalties the Biſhops accuſe us as the cauſes of all, and as wilful Schiſmaticks, and call for the Execution of the Laws againſt us.

4. We ſay, we dare not do that, which when ever they will give us leave, we are ready to give our reaſons why we take it for heinous ſin againſt God, and tending to the ruine of the Church: nor dare we forſake our Miniſtry while the Churches neceſſities are to us paſt doubt.

5. We beg of them but to abate us ſome needleſs Oaths, and Covenants, and Profeſſions, and a few things called *indifferent* by the Impoſers, that we may all live in Chriſtian Love and Peace, and we offer them as unqueſtionable ſecurity for our Peaceableneſs, Loyalty, and Orthodoxneſs, as the ſaid Oaths, Promiſes, or Profeſſions can be.

6. They tell us, *Nothing is to be abated us, and we must cease preaching, the Rule must not be altered; we will do more harm in the Church than out; Projects for Moderation most distract the Church; There is no Concord or Liberty to be expected, but by our total obedience to the Bishops; It is obeying the Church, yea the Universal Church of Bishops, that is the only way to Concord.*

7. To confute this Supposition, which is the root of our Calamities, I transcribe out of History and the Acts of Councils, how great a hand in the Schisms, and Heresies, and Confusions of Christians, those Bishops have had, who have swelled up above the primitive species, by vast Dioceses, Wealth, and claim of Government over other Churches and Bishops; and that it is notorious that this Grandeur and exorbitant power of Bishops, singly or in Councils, hath been so far from keeping the Church from Schisms, that it hath been one of the greatest causes of the Schisms of most Ages, since such a sort of Prelacy sprung up, and that Popery came not up in a day, but rose from that Juniority to its present Maturity. This was my work.

§ 13. He truly tells you, that the *Original of all mischiefs is the Lusts that war in our Members, and not this or that Order of Men.*]

When the World had a good Pope, if God would bless that Order of men, some think he might do more good than any other man. But he hath toucht the Core of the Churches Malady. Verily, the grand Strife is between the *Flesh* and *Spirit*, the seed of the Serpent and of the Woman: And if Patriarchs and Diocesans were but as much set on the promoting of a holy and heavenly Life, as those Ministers are whom they silence and imprison, they might do much good, though the largeness of their Dioceses render them uncapable of performing the 40th part of a true Bishops Work. No doubt but Bishop *Hall*, and *Potter*, and *Usher*, &c. did much good, by such preaching, writing, and good living, as others use that are no Bishops.

But will fire burn without fewel? And will it not burn if combustible fewel be contiguous? Do not the *Lusts that war in our Members* live upon that food which we are forbidden to provide? Do you think that the *Lust* of the Flesh doth not more desire Riches than Poverty, Honour than a low Estate, Domination over others, to have our Will on all, than humble Subjection? Where the Carkass is there will the Eagles be gathered

ed. Do not you your ſelf ſay, that the Biſhops and Church grew more corrupt after the third Century? Do you believe that when a Biſhops Power was made equal to a great Lords, or more, and all his Pomp and Riches anſwerable, that the Luſt of the Fleſh would not more greedily deſire it, than it would deſire a meer mediocrity? Or that a worldly proud man would not ſeek more for Lordſhip and Greatneſs, than a *Syneſius*, and ſuch others as you ſay fled from it? If the poor retired Monks were as bad as you make them, what wonder if great Lordly Biſhops were much worſe? Will not the fire of Luſt grow greater as the fewel is greater?

I am ſatisfied that Riches and Power well uſed, may greatly ſerve the Intereſt of Religion: But two things muſt be conſidered.

1. That the *greateſt Power and Wealth* being far more deſired by carnal Worldlings, (that is, by bad men) than by mortified heavenly minded men, the more men deſire them, the more eagerly they will ſeek them by Friends, Flattery, or any means: and therefore the liker they are to attain them, except when the chooſers are ſome reſolved godly men. And ſo which way can a Succeſſion of the worſt men be avoided? But a mediocrity that doth not to the Fleſh overweigh the labours and difficulties of the ſacred Office, will encourage the good, and not much tempt the bad: Or if good men will be never ſo bountiful to pious uſes, their bounty and Church-Lands may better maintain Labourers enough for the work, than be made a ſnare to one.

2. And that Power which depopulateth and deſtroys its end, is unlawful in its very ſtate, as well as in its uſe. The Power of one man to be ſole Phyſician to the City, and to have none but Apothecaries under him; or of one man to be the only School-Maſter in the County, and have none but Uſhers under him, is rather to be called *Deſtruction* than *Power*. It is Biſhops caſting out Power that I am againſt, that is, the neceſſary Power of the Keys in the Pariſh Miniſters, or putting down neceſſary Biſhops; and alſo a Power to ſilence Chriſts faithful Miniſters, and deprive Souls of the neceſſary means, by impoſing things needleſs in themſelves, and ſinful in the receiver, that after his beſt ſearch believes them ſuch.

Seeing then that we are agreed, that it is the *Luſt that warreth*

reth in men, that is the corrupter of the Church, let but the face of the whole Romane Clergy these 1000 Years at least tell us, whether it be not the swelling of the Power and Wealth of Bishops, that hath caused so long a Succession of a worldly, lustful, tyranical Clergy.

§ 14. And he truly saith, [*p.* 306. that the *generality of men when they have gained Wealth and Honour, are commonly willing to secure the enjoyment of those Possessions, by letting things run in their ordinary course.*

(The Spanish Proverb is, *The World is a Carryon, and they are Dogs that love it,* and they will snarle at any that would take it from them, and if it lie in the Ditch, Dogs rather than Men will gather about it: and its pitty such men should by such a Bait be tempted into the sacred Chair.) And he truly adds, that *Repulse and Disappointment will end such mens Patience.* For really as the man is, such are his desires: It is not only turgent Prelacy but a Prelatical Spirit that troubleth the Church: And If *Novatianus* or *Arius* would fain be a Prelate, it is in his heart; and no wonder if he be a Schismatick; *Trahit sua quemque voluptas.* Appetite is the Spring of Action. All the Popes Clergy are much of his mind; for they participate of his worldly Interest, and depend on him, and therefore participate of the Papal Spirit. The Interest of the General and Army are conjunct.

§ 15. And its true that he saith, that *the Bishops Interest obligeth him to maintain Peace and Unity.* And so no doubt from that sense of Interest it is endeavoured, in *Italy, Spain, France, Germany,* &c. when a strong man armed keeps his house, the things which he possesseth are in Peace. But whether therefore the People did ill that forsook the Bishops and followed *Luther*, or are all bound to cleave to the Bishops Unity, is the doubt.

§ 16. Whether it be true, *p.* 310 that *very few if any one were Bishops when they turned Hereticks,* I have enquired in the Preface; though if they ascended from Heresie to Prelacy it's all one to me. But by this I conjecture that he taketh fewer for Hereticks than others do, and that he pretends acquaintance with their minds, in that antecedent part of their Lives which no History mentioneth. I confess I think that for the most part men are Papists before they are Popes or Papist Bishops: And yet I think that it is first the *desire of Papal and Prelatical Grandeur,*

deur, and next the *Exercise of it*, which is the cause of Schism and Persecution.

§ 17. I verily believe as he doth, that Platonick Philosophy, and a willingness to win the Heathens by compliance, had a great hand in corrupting many Doctrines; and not only Monks but others of the most religious Christians, had a great hand in many of the ancient Superstitions, especially those that tended to the over-honouring of their Martyrs, and too much advancement of their Bishops, when they came newly from under the Persecution of the Heathens. But it came not to be universal, nor the Engine of great Corruption and cruelty, till the Bishops turned all into a Law. Who could make any of all this necessary, but Pope, Prelates, or Princes, who pretended a Legislative Power hereto? Even *Luther* and *Melanthon* were indifferent to diverse Ceremonies, so they were made to be indifferently used. But when they are made necessary by a Law (specially more necessary to a Minister than his Ministry, and to a private Christian, than his Church Communion, who doth more vehemently condemn them than they?

§ 18. That *Paschasius Radbertus* was the first that broached the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, is a doubtful expression. Either he meaneth the *Name* or only the *Thing* under another Name. If the latter, he will do more than *Edm. Albertinus*, or Bp. *Consius* have done, if he prove it: If it be the name that he meaneth, I think (by my Memory, for I will not for that go read him all over) that he will not find the name in *Radbertus*, nor any where before *Stephanus Eduensis*, about 130 years after him: and that all that he can truly say, is but as *Bellarmine* doth, [*Hic Author primus fuit qui seriò & copiosè scripsit de veritate Corporis & Sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia contra Bertramum Presbyterum.*

§ 19. *That the Bishops charged* by me *with these Corruptions, were the only Opposers of them that we find in antiquity, as we may see in the Canons of* Africk *and* Spain,] is a saying very near kin to much of his History: I confess that so few Presbyters in comparison of Bishops were publick Actors, whose Judgments were notified to the World, that it's no wonder (after *Constantine*'s time) if there be more proofs of their words and deeds than of other mens: But there are a great number of excellent men here slandered against the credit of all Church-History, and their

their own Writings yet in our hands. Would it be worth the Readers Price and Labour, I could ſwell my Book with the proof that what he ſpeaketh is untrue. Did he think that I could not prove that *Juſtin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origene, Arnobius, Lactantius, Macarius, Maternus Firmicus, Ephrem Syrus, Fauſtinus, Hierome, Ruffinus, Prudentius, Sulpitius Severus, Sedulius, Mammertus, Caſſianus, Vincent. Lirinenſis, Socrates, Sozomen, Iſodore Peluſiota*, &c. did ſomething in oppoſition to ſome Church-Corruptions? Though ſome of them promoted ſome others: Yea, *Antonie* and abundance of Monks that furthered ſome, oppoſed others no leſs dangerous: Though many of them may be accuſed as *Bellarmine* doth *Sulpit. Severus*, for ſaying, *Eccleſiam auro non ſtrui ſed deſtrui.*

Judge of time paſt by what we ſee; Is it *only* the Biſhops that are againſt the Popes Church-Corrupting Uſurpation in *Italy, Spain, France*, &c. Is it *only* the Biſhops that are againſt the Maſs Corruptions, and againſt all their corrupt Doctrines of Indulgences, Purgatory, Images, *&c.* and againſt all their Ceremonies, and prophane abuſe of holy things? Was it only the Biſhops at *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, that were againſt ſuppreſſing the Bohemian and Moravian Reformation? In the end of *Lydius* upon *Prateolus* you may read a Letter ſubſcribed by ſo great a number of Lords and great men, for *John Hus*, and *Hierome*, and the Reformation, which yet prevailed not with the Biſhops, as will tell you who was then the greateſt Oppoſers of Church-Corruption. And I think Princes and Drs. oppoſed it more than Bps. in *Luther's* time. Is it only the Biſhops that have oppoſed warping towards *Rome* for Church-Unity? Have none but Biſhops been againſt corrupting the Churches, by ſilencing good Miniſters and ordaining bad ones? The things that are, have been. I confeſs our difference is great on the caſe, *what is to be accounted Church-Corruption.* For that which in one Country goeth for Corruption, in another (yea the ſame) goeth for *Church-Glory, Strength, and Beauty*; Our main difference is about what's good, and what's bad; what's Virtue, and what's Vice.

§ 20. He next comes to *Sedition*, and asketh [*What Reign have they diſturbed here with their Sedition?*] And becauſe he knoweth that I can refer him to the large Volume of their Treaſons written by *Prin*, and abroad to the many Volumes in *Goldaſtus*,

daſtus, and the many Hiſtories of the Wars of Popes and Councils againſt Emperours,] he prevents all my Proof with a downright Untruth, that [" *If a man be not blind he may ſee that my* " *Hiſtory is only deſigned againſt Proteſtant Biſhops under a general* " *name.*

Anſ. Was it not enough ſo groſly to write this Untruth of me, but he muſt alſo reproach all the Readers as blind that will not judge falſly of what they read? Doth he know my meaning better than my ſelf? He knoweth that I plead for the Primitive Epiſcopacy, and that I profeſs to intend this Hiſtory moſt to diſcover the Riſe, Growth, and Maturity of the Popiſh deſtructive ſort of Prelacy. Readers, can you believe this man, that I wrote the caſe of the Biſhops before and under Popery, and of the Popes, and of above Five hundred Councils, and all theſe before the name of a Proteſtant Biſhop was known in the World, and as he ſaith, gathered their faults, and all this only againſt the Proteſtant Biſhops, and not againſt Popes or Prelates, or any of the Councils that I named?

Perhaps he would tempt me to refer him to the Hiſtory of Biſhop *Laud*'s Trial, or to what Biſhop *Abbot*, *George* and *Robert*, Biſhop *Hall* and others ſaid againſt him: Or to tell him of A. Bp. *Williams* Arms for the Parliament. But theſe are not Subjects fit for our Debates.

§ 21. *P.* 318. When I ſay, that *where Prelacy with the Papiſts is at the higheſt, Princes are at the loweſt.* He asketh, *Is it the Biſhop or the Papiſt that is here to blame? Is this the effect of their Order?*

Anſ. 1. I thought the Pope of *Rome* and the Biſhop of *Rome* had been the ſame. 2. But this Corrector of Hiſtory taking Untruths not only into the *Completion*, but the *Stamina* and Scope of his Book, among all the reſt ſuppoſeth me to ſpeak againſt *a Biſhop as a Biſhop*, when I have troubled him with my repeating ſo often that I *am for Biſhops*, and that it is not the *Office* but the *tumor*, and that *tumor* that maketh another *ſpecies* which I oppoſe. Doth he not think that the Popes Biſhoprick is faulty (yea, as a *corrupt ſpecies?*) And as it is more *tumid* than the *Patriarchs*, is not the *Patriarchs* more *tumid* than the *Metropolitanes*, and that than the *Dioceſanes?* And if Dr. *Hammond* were not deceived, who thought that *there were no ſtated worſhipping Aſſemblies in Scripture times without a preſent*

Bishop, is not the *sole Bishop* of a Thousand or a Hundred such Assemblies different from a Bishop of *One only?* And if many Canons speak truly, that say a Bishop should be in *every City* that hath a *Church*, and every great Town like our Corporations and Market Towns was called a City, doth not a Bishop of one City, and a Bishop of 50, or 40, or 10, differ so far, that a man may be against one without being against the other? Doth he speak against Patriarchs that speaks against the Pope? Or against Dioceſanes that speaks against Patriarchs? Or against the Primitive Bishops that speaks only against such Dioceſanes as put them all down, and all their Churches, and almost all true Discipline of such Churches, like *Erastians*.

§ 22. *P.* 319. 322. His Charge on *Socrates* and *Sozomene* (shaking the credit of Church History) as writing that [*which no reasonable man can believe as it is related by them, without loving a malicious Lye.*] I spake to before: If such Historians *believed* not what they write or *loved a malicious Lye*; alas, whom shall we believe? Is he better than they?

And his note that *Valesius* judged *Eusebius Nicomed* no *Heretick*, I before-noted.

But I will follow that case no further, lest he should draw me to seem to charge the ancient Bishops with sedition, whom I never intended so to charge; but only to desire those that can excuse the Language *e. g.* of *Gregory* the great to *Phocas*, of *Ambrose* to *Eugenius*, of the Bishops to *Maximus*, and many such like, not implacably to reproach and hunt those that did no more or not so much.

§ 23. His full Stomach dischargeth itself against me three times over with one charge, *P.* 314, 320, 352. [Oliver Cromwell *and his Son, the* David *and* Absalom *of Mr.* B.] And [*He compares the most barbarous villain in the World to King* David, *in his Epistle to his Son.*

Ans. Reader if there be no such word in any of my Writings, after all these Accusations of this man and many such other, I must leave it to thy self how thou wilt name these men, their History, and their dealings; for if I name them they will say I rail.

Yea, what if this very man (it's easie to know why and whence) doth even here, *p.* 352. *&c.* reprint the very Epistle which he thus accuseth, and cite no such word, to tell us that he

he knew there was no such word there, and yet thus affirmeth it, what will you call this?

The words cited by himself are these, [" *Many observe that* " *you have been strangly kept from participating in any of our late* " *bloody Contentions, that God might make you a Healer of our* " *Breaches, and employ you in that Temple Work, which* David " *himself might not be honoured with, though it was in his mind, be-* " *cause he had shed blood abundantly, and made great Wars.* 1 *Chr.* 22. 7, 8.]

Had I said what is this Week published, as one of their chief Dr's Elegy upon Oliver Cromwell, *(with two others) what should I have heard? What abundance of Confusions flattered* Oliver, *while I openly disowned him as a Usurper; but now their malice hath got the handle.*

Is here ever a word of *Oliver?* Is he here called *David?* Did I not purposely say, [*David himself*] and cite the Text, lest any should feign the same that he doth? Any man may see that he hath nothing to say, but to accuse my Thoughts, and suspect that I had such a meaning. And who made him acquainted with Thoughts that were never uttered? Or made him a Judge of them? If his and other mens thoughts may be thus by conjecture accused, no Enemy need to want matter of Accusation.

It's like he will appeal to my Conscience whether it were not my thought? And 1. By what authority will he so do? 2. But I will shrive my self to him this once. It is so long since, that truly I remember not what was in my Thoughts, any further than my words express: But I well remember my *former Actions*, and what was then *my judgment of* Oliver and his Actions, and I use not to speak against my judgment. Many knew that he being acquainted the first day that I went into the Army, (which was after *Naseby* Fight) that I was sent by an Assembly of Divines, to try whether I could turn the Soldiers against his subverting Designs, (then first discovered to me,) he would never once speak to me while I was in the Army; and that ever after I was driven away, I openly in Pulpit, Press and Conference disowned, and warned men to disown his Actions against King and Parliament, and his Usurpation; and that I wrote against the Engagement: And therefore I do not think that ever I meant to call him *David*, and I am sure I never *did it*. But they say old Men can see better afar off than near at hand; and so all these notorious Untruths about visible present things, may yet consist with such mens credibility about things said and done 1300 Years ago.

§ 24. And now I am here, I must not pass by his friendly Admonition, *p.* 357. after his reciting my Epistles, [" *If I were as*

" *worthy to adviſe Mr.* B. *as he was to adviſe* Cromwell, *I would* " *ſay, It were much more adviſeable for a Chriſtian, ſpecially for* " *one that thinks he is ſo near his eternal State, to repent and cry* " peccavimus, *than to ſtand on Juſtification of the fact,* &c.]

Anſ. 1. Is was uſual for men to chooſe their own Confeſſours: But it being the Cuſtom of the times for Paſtors and Confeſſors to be forced on Diſſenters, I will ſubmit now to your way, though my former Confeſſions and my Communion with you have been turned to Reproach and Scorn.

1. I do daily beg earneſtly of God, to let none of my ſins be unknown to me, and taken for no ſin, and be unrepented of; and that he would forgive that which I would fain know, and do not.

2. I do not repent of owning *Oliver*'s Actions againſt King and Parliament, or his Uſurpation; for I never owned them, nor the Actions of them that ſet up his Son.

3. I do not repent that I loved the Peace of the Church, and that I deſired the Governour, though a Uſurper, ſhould do good and not evil.

4. I do not repent that ſeeing the Armies Rebellions and Confuſions, I ſtirred up Rulers and People to take heed of favouring ſo great Sin.

5. But I do now by experience of other ways perceive that I was ſometimes too eager in aggravating mens Errours, and repent that I uſed not more forbearance of ſome of my Accuſations of ſome of them.

6. I did think that *Richard Cromwell* was an Uſurper: But when we had been twelve Years at leaſt without a rightful Governour, I then thought as *Thomas White*, alias *Blacklow*, the moderate Papiſt, wrote, that the Land could not ſubſiſt in Society without ſome Government, and that *No-Government* is worſe to the People than a *Uſurped one*: And that it is ſomtime lawful to *ſubmit* and *uſe* an Uſurper, when it is not lawful to approve his Entrance. And wherein I was deceived I am willing to be better informed.

7. But I do unfeignedly repent that I wrote thoſe two Epiſtles, though it was to put a man on to do good, whom I *never ſaw, nor ever had the leaſt to do with.*

8. And I do more repent of the cauſe of all, *viz. that I appointed God a time*, and limited his Providence; and thought that

that becauſe ſo many Armies and Endeavours had failed Twelve or Fourteen Years, that had attempted the reſtoring of the King, therefore there was no probability of accompliſhing it: I do not repent that I was not a Prophet, to know before what God would do; for it was not in my power; nor do I repent that I preached Chriſts Goſpel under Uſurpers; but I repent that I waited not Gods time, and did not better conſider that want of humane Power is no hinderance to Omnipotency, and nothing is difficult to him.

9. I was drawn too far by Mr. *Harringtons* Scorn, and the diſlike of Sir *Henry Vane*'s Attempts for a Common-Wealth, to meddle with matters of Government, and to write my Political Aphoriſms, called, *A Holy Common-Wealth*: And I do unfeignedly repent that ever I wrote and publiſhed it, and had not more confined my ſelf to the matters proper to my Calling, and let thoſe meddle with forms of Government who were fitter for it.

All theſe, beſides what's formerly ſaid to Mr. *Bagſhaw*, I declare my unfeigned Repentance of. And though it pleaſeth you to feign me a Schiſmatick, and hater of Repentance, (for ſpeaking againſt the faults that needed it) I ſhall thank you to be a real helper of me in ſo neceſſary a work as Repentance is.

And that I may do the like by you, I ſhall now only requite you with this Advice, that before you write next, you will ſet before your Eyes the Ninth Commandment, *Thou ſhalt not bear falſe Witneſs againſt thy Neighbour*: And that when you ſay your Prayers, you would be ſerious when you ſay, *Lord have Mercy upon us, and encline our hearts to keep this Law.*

§ 25. A Roman Zeal tells us, that Faction and Schiſm, when animated by worldly Intereſt, and grown up to a malignant hatred of the things and perſons that are averſe to it, is hardly bounded, but is thriving up towards deſtructive Perſecution, as ſwelling Prelacy did towards the Papacy and the Inquiſition. It is not one or two Fiſhes that will ſatisfie the ſtomach of a Pike: Nor is it the ſlandering or ruining of one or two men, or ſilencing of one or two of the Miniſters of Chriſt, that will ſatisfie a malignant Spirit. One Meal will not make a lean Man fat. Whether there be a Legion in thoſe that would deſtroy a Legion of Chriſts Servants, or one have ſo much Power I know not; but the effects tell us *what manner of Spirit they are of.* But let the Papiſts paſs.

§ 26.

§ 26. When I read *p.* 337, and 358, 359. and such passages, it makes me think of them that cried, [*His Blood be on us, and our Children,*] together with our Judge's words, [*In as much as you did it or did it not to one of the least of these my Brethren, you did it or did it not to me.*] P. 337. he saith, [" *There is great* " *reason to value the peaceable Resignation of the Nonconformists,* " *when we consider by what Usurpation and Violence they were brought* " *in, and what a number of worthy learned Ministers were turned* " *out to make vacancies for these men, who were to instruct the Peo-* " *ple in new Mysteries of Religion, which their old Pastors had not* " *the Conscience or Ability to teach them, that is, of the lawfulness* " *of Rebellion.*--- And p. 358, &c. *There were many of those Mini-* " *sters Usurpers, and had intruded into the Churches of other men,* " *who had been silenced and cast out.*--- *There were many others that* " *were intruders into the Ministry, and such not a few of them as* " *Mr.* B. *himself would not have thought fit to have continued. All* " *the rest were such as would not submit to the Rule that was then* " *established in the Church, but chose rather to leave their Livings,* " *and the Bishops could not help it, any otherwise than as they were* " *Members of Parliament; for it was the Law that tied them to* " *their choice, and not the Bishops. If Mr.* B. *means what happened* " *before the last Civil Wars, as it's likely he may, then these ancient* " *Teachers were the instruments of an Antimonarchical, Antiepisco-* " *pal Faction: They would preach but they would not conform to the* " *Established Religion: Nay many of them would preach against it,* " *and against their Governours too. These were such Incendiaries as* " *no Government would endure,* &c.]

Ans. When you have noted this part of his History, it will not be hard to judge of his credibility.

I. The things that he defendeth is the silencing and prosecuting of three sorts of Ministers. 1. Many Hundreds of Nonconformists in the days of Qu. *Eliz.* K. *James*, and some few in the time of K. *Charles* 1. 2. Many Conformists in the time of K. *Charles* 1. under Bishop *Laud.* 3. About 2000 that conform not to the New Laws of Uniformity in the time of K. *Ch.* 2. What these Ministers were or are, and what the fruits of their silencing have been, and what it hath done to the Church of *England*, and to many Thousands of Godly Christians, I will not be judge: Nor will I dispute that which all *England* sees or feels. But it seems so well done to our Historian, as that he is willing

willing deliberately to *juſtifie* or defend it, which as I underſtand is to make it his own, and to undertake to be one of thoſe that ſhall anſwer for it. What if another had done as much againſt him, as he hath done againſt himſelf? And for how ſmall a prize?

II. As he before would *inſinuate*, that what is ſaid of the great number of Drunkards, and ignorant men turned out, was falſe, though ſo judged upon the Oaths of men accounted the greateſt lovers of Religion in their Pariſhes; ſo he ſeemeth here to intimate that it was only or chiefly into the places of learned worthy men, that the ſilenced Miniſters ſucceeded; whereas it was not one of many that came into any ſuch mens places of them that were ſilenced at the fatal *Bartholomew* day.

III. He ſeemeth to intimate, that when the Parliament (ſuppoſe by wrong) put out either ſuch as he or I deſcribe, the Land muſt be under an Interdict till the Biſhops and King were reſtored, and that Chriſts Goſpel was no more to be preached in *England*, till Dioceſanes returned, but all Souls be given up to Damnation, unleſs Chriſt would ſave them without the preaching of his Goſpel, and the Land was to be left to the Devil and Paganiſm. And who can deny now but the *Dioceſane Species* is *eſſential* to the Church?

IV. When I ſpake only of the ſilencing and ejecting Act, of *Aug.* 24 1662. he would make the Reader believe, that this Change was to reſtore the Churches to their ejected Paſtors, or caſt out Uſurpers; whereas unleſs Ignorance or worſe hinder him, he knoweth that all that were caſt out and were alive, laid claim to their Benefices, and were reſtored before that, and their Livings reſigned quietly to them, to ſay nothing of the reſt that were ſuppoſed to be at the Lord Chancellors diſpoſal. Thoſe that were put out that the ſequeſtred might re-enter, were none of them ſilenced, nor made uncapable of other Livings till *Auguſt* 24. 1662.

V. He would inſinuate that it was only the *Nonconformiſts* that were caſt out of ſuch ſequeſtrations: Whereas in the Countries that I either lived in or heard of, it was as many or more of the Conformiſts, that had ſequeſtred Livings and were caſt out, and took new preſentations.

VI. And this is evident by his Intimation, as if it were a very great number of the Church Livings that were ſo poſſeſt:

Whereas

Whereas of Nine Thousand or Ten Thousand Ministers then in Possession, Seven or Eight Thousand Conformed: Therefore it's likely that the Conformists had most of the Sequestrations.

VII. He tells you that the Ejected Ministers were brought in to instruct the People in the Lawfulness of Rebellion: Doth not this intimate that this was the case only or chiefly of the silenced Nonconformists? But I have oft cited *Jewel* defending the French Protestants; Was not he a Bishop? I have oft cited *Bilson*, affirming it no Rebellion if the Nobles and People defend their Legal Constitution against one that will--- (I will not recite the rest.) ------ I have oft cited *Ri. Hooker* whose popular Principles I have confuted, and goeth higher against absolute Monarchy, than I or any of my Correspondency did in all the Wars. *Heylin* is for Conciliation with the Papists: He knoweth not their Writings who knoweth not that the Papists are more for popular Election, and Power towards Princes, far than ever such as I were. And had he not put his Head and Eyes into a Bag, he could hardly have denied but that they were Episcopal Conformists on both sides that began the War: But being got into the dark he loudly denieth it.

VIII. He saith, *There were many others that himself would not have thought fit to have continued. Anſ.* I thought I was more likely to know them than he. I remember not one such of an hundred that did not conform. I confess that when the Prelatical party intreated me no longer to refuse the *Westminster* Commissioners Letters, deputing me with others to try and judge of some Episcopal Conformists that stood then for Livings, to avoid all seeming opposition to that way I did stretch as far as I durst, to approve and keep in some Conformists, of very low parts who knew not a quarter so much as some Lay People did: But none of these were Nonconformists.

IX. He saith, [*All the rest were such as would not submit to the Rule then established in the Church.* This is true: And what was that Rule? Did *Peter* or *Paul* make it, or submit to it? Did they refuse any thing that God commanded in Nature or Scripture? Or any Circumstantials necessary *in genere* left *in specie* to the Magistrates determination? They were guilty of believing that God is above man, and that there is no Power but of God, and none against him; and that we must please him whoever

whoever be displeased. They were guilty of so much Self-love as to be unwilling to be damned for a Benefice, or for a Bishops Will. They did not consent to profess Assent and Consent to all things contained in and prescribed by three Books, written by such as declare themselves to be fallible; and such as not one of Fourty ever saw before they declared the said Assent and Consent to them. They did not consent to cast out all Infants from Christendom, whose Parents durst not offer them to Baptism, under the Sacramental Symbol of the Cross; nor unless they might have themselves been Covenanters, Undertakers, or Promisers for them, as well as the Godfathers: Or that scrupled getting Strangers to undertake that perfidiously for their Children which they never intended to perform. They durst not read Excommunications against Christs true Servants, nor repel those from Christian Communion, who scruple kneeling in the reception of the Sacrament: They durst not swear that many Thousands whom they never knew are not obliged by the Covenant, when they know not in what sence they took it: For they are not willing to believe that the compounding Lords and Knights did not put a good sence on it before they took it. They durst not say that all is so well in our Church Government by Dioceſanes, Lay-Chancellours Power of the Keys, Archdeacons, Officials, Commissaries, *&c.* that we may swear against all endeavours to amend it by any alteration; They do believe that the Law of Nature is Gods Law, and that as it alloweth a single Person only private defence, so it alloweth every Nation publick defence against Enemies notorious destroying assaults: And they dare not swear or covenant, that if any should from the Lord Chancellour, *&c.* get a Commission to seize on the Kings Navy, Treasures, Forts, Guards, Person, and to seize on the Lives and Estates of all his Innocent Subjects, that it is unlawful to resist any that execute such a Commission. They find it so hard a Controversie, what God doth with the dying Infants of Atheists, Infidels, Mahometanes, and Persecutors, that they dare not declare, that if any of their Children be baptized and die, *it is certain by the word of God that they are undoubtedly saved.* We say not that the Law binds us to any of the evil which we fear: But we dare not take Oaths and Promises which we understand not.

Abundance I pretermit.

He is extreamly cenſorious if he think that Mr. *R. Hooker*, Bp. *Bilſon*, Bp. *Grindal*, A. Bp. *Abbot*, Bp. *Rob. Abbot*, Bp. *Jewel*, &c. would have been Conformiſts had they been now alive.

X. He ſaith, [*They choſe rather to leave their Livings.*] *Anſ.* They choſe not to conform, but ſubmitted only to leave their Livings; *Eligere eſt agere.* They were paſſive in this, they refuſed to conform as ſuppoſed by them a heinous Sin, but they choſe not to be ſilenced or caſt out; but they *choſe* to *endure* it when the Biſhops choſe it for them.

XI. He ſaith, that [*the Biſhops could not help it any otherwiſe than as they were Members of Parliament.*

Anſ. 1. I confeſs Scripture uſeth the like Phraſe, *Can the Leopard change his Spots*, &c. or they that are *accuſtomed to do evil learn to do well?* And Rom. 8. 6, 7. *The carnal mind is enmity againſt God, for it is not ſubject to his Law, nor can be.*] I will not hereto too much contradict him, 2. But is it nothing that they could have done in Parliament, had they been willing? 3. Is it unlawful for us to know if he know it not, or deny it, how much the Biſhops and Clergy did with the Parliament-Men? 4. He ſhould at leaſt have ſtayed till Dr. *Bates*, Dr. *Jacomb*, and I are dead, who wrote and diſputed with the Biſhops by the Kings Commiſſion, before he had talkt at this rate to the World. Did not the King make his Declaration about Eccleſiaſtical Affairs? And did he not under the broad Seal commiſſion thoſe Biſhops and Doctors to treat with us for the *making ſuch alterations as were neceſſary to tender Conſciences?* Did they not maintain that *no alterations were thereto neceſſary*, and ſo end the treaty. 5. Did they not in their next Convocation lay aſide the Kings Indulgent Declaration, and make the Additions to the Liturgy? And yet could they not help it? Nor was it none of their doings? 6. Doth not *England* know that Parliaments ſince have by experience perceived their Miſtake, and would have ſuſpended our Proſecution, and reſtored us to Unity, and the Biſhops and Clergy will not conſent but rage againſt it, and preach and write to have us executed according to the Laws, and no abatement to be made, and as this man, think that the Churches *Diſtraction* is from *Projects of Moderation*. What name ſhould one give to ſuch Hiſtories as theſe? The guilty cannot bear their names.

XII. He

XII. He saith, [*It was the Law that tied them to their choice and not the Bishops.*

Ans. 1. Suppose the word *choice* were proper here, [Is it any justification of the Executioners?] It was the Emperour *Charles* the 5th's Edict that tied all the Protestant Ministers to conform to the *Interim*, or be gone: It was the Law that tied the Martyrs in Qu. *Maries* days to profess what they believed not, or to be burnt. Alas! How could *Bonner* and *Gardiner* help it? 2. But how many Bishops were against the passing of that Bill? And who perswaded the Lay-Men to it? Must we not know when it's night if you deny it?

XIII. He tells you, that [*the ancient silenced Teachers before the Civil Wars, were the Instruments of Antimonarchical and Antiepiscopal Faction.*

Ans. 1. Which of them all said so much as Mr. *Hooker*, Bp. *Bilson*, Bp. *Jewel*, &c. have done? 2. If you make any Conscience of the 9th Commandment, prove the Truth of what you say of those that were suspended and driven out of the Kingdom in the times of A. Bp. *Laud*, Bp. *Wren*, Bp. *Piercy*, &c. for not reading the Book for Lords-days Dancing and Sports, and that were prosecuted for Preaching twice on the Lords-day, and for not turning the Table Altar-wise, and railing it in, which even Bp. *Montague* as well as *Williams* was against. Was Bishop *Miles Smyth* of *Gloucester*, were A. Bp. *Abbot* or *Grindall Antimonarchical* or *Antiepiscopal?* 3. Prove if you are able any Antimonarchical Principles, Words, or Deeds by Mr. *Hildersham*, Mr. *Brinsley*, Mr. *Paul Baine*, Mr. *Dod*, Mr. *Knewstubs*, and hundreds of such I might name. The most malicious are fain to talk of one *Knox*, or one *Goodman*, or one *Junius Brutus*, (that is, *Hubertus Languetus Melanchthons* friend) or somewhat in *Buchanan*, not the tenth part so much as is commonly said by the Papists, with whom our A. Bp. *Bromhall* and his Companions so much plead for Concord. 4. Doth not *Al. Cope*, and *Sanders*, and *Pateson* in the *Image of both Churches*, and lately the nominal *Bellamy* in his *Philanax Anglicus*, and many more such, say all the same of the Bishops and Church of *England*, and all that they deride as [*Protestants* of *Sincerity*] as guilty of far more rebellious Principles and Practices, than ever you can prove by the meer Nonconformists old or new? And is it enough to accuse?

XIV. He saith, *They would preach but they would not conform to the established Religion.*

Ans. 1. But why should they be forbidden to preach (which was good and they were devoted to?) If a man will not *do all* that you would have him to do, shall he *do nothing?*

2. What was that which he calleth the *Established Religion?* It was the Ceremonies and Subscription, *that there is nothing in the Liturgy contrary to the Word of God.*] And was this a Crime worthy the forbidding men to preach the Gospel? Or why should the Souls of Thousands of the Innocent People be so heavily punished for another mans omission, even because the Teachers fear Conformity.

3. But still we see what these mens *Religion* is: Had their Religion been the Scripture, or any Doctrine or Worship common to the Christian or Protestant Churches, the old Nonconformists willingly consented to it. But here they shew that their Ceremonies and proper Liturgy forms are their Religion. But then 1. Why do Dr. *Burges* and all that plead for your Ceremonies and Invention, build all on this, that you make them not any parts of Worship or Religion, (which they confess man may not invent) but meer accidents? 2. How *old* then is *your Religion*? Your Liturgy was made since *Luther* began his Reformation. 3. It seems then that you are not of the same Religion with the Protestants that have none of your Ceremonies, Liturgy or Subscriptions. 4. Is not then your Church of a singular Religion from all the World, and consequently a singular Church? And is it the whole Catholick Church then, or a Schismatical Church?

I confess that you shew more evidently than by such words, that your self made Rules and Circumstances are your Religion: For 1. You make Conformity to them to be *de facto* more necessary than *our* Preaching the Gospel, or *our* Church Communion, or any publick Church Worship of God. 2. And you excommunicate by your Rule or Canon every Member of Christ in *England*, that doth but think and say, that any thing of your Imposition, Liturgy, Ceremonies, or Government are sinful. 3. And yet when you have done you call all your Impositions *things indifferent*. 4. And thereby you declare that your *Religion* in part is a thing *indifferent*. 5. And no Man or Woman shall be of your Church that cannot know *all the indifferent*,

different things in the *World* which may be impoſed on them, to be *Indifferent* and not *Unlawful*; when you know (or you know not whom you dwell among) that we have much adoe to get one half your Church to know *things neceſſary*. 6. The Papiſts that put a greater neceſſity on their Inventions will deride you for an *Indifferent Religion*.

There was a poor Puritane Nonconformiſt that feared Lying, that went about the Streets with Ink to ſell, and was wont truly to cry, [*Very good Ink, very good Ink*;] but once his Ink a little miſcarried, and he durſt not call it [*Very good*,] but cried, *Pretty good Ink, Pretty good Ink*,] and no body would buy of him, and he loſt his Ink. And if you cry up [*An indifferent Religion*,] whatever you have for numbers, you will have for quality but an *Indifferent Church*, (ſave our Rulers.)

XV. But he adds, [*Many of them would preach againſt it and their Governours too.*]

Anſ. 1. You tempt them towards it. If I ask the Butcher [*Is your Meat ſweet?*] and he ſay it is *indifferent*, I am excuſable if I think it ſtinks. 2. They judge by the effects: They thought that when an *indifferent* thing caſteth out a neceſſary thing, it becomes naught. 3. But yet your Accuſation is unfaithful: Why did you not ſay then, that it was not for *Nonconformity* that men were caſt out, but for *preaching againſt your Religion?* Who were thoſe? Was it proved? If ſo, what was that to the reſt? Do you puniſh many learned moderate men for the fault of a few others that they were not concerned with? You now alledge Mr. *Hilderſham, Ball, Bradſhaw, Baine, Knewſtubs*, and abundance ſuch, for being againſt *Separation*, and perſuading men to come to the Common Prayer, (and many of them to kneel at the Sacrament,) and yet when you plead for their Silencing, even other mens words may ſerve againſt them.

XVI. To conclude, in all he layeth the cauſe of their ſilence on themſelves for not conforming, and yet will not tell us what we ſhould do to help it. Would they have us Conform while we judge it as ſinful as I have mentioned in my firſt *Plea for Peace*? No; they profeſs the contrary. Would they have us believe all to be lawful? We cannot: Our Judgments are not at our Command: What would they have us do to change? Worldly Intereſt maks us too willing! We ſtudy as hard as they!

We

We earneſtly beg Gods Illumination to ſave us from Er rour We read all that they write to convince us: And the more we read, ſtudy, and pray, the more heinous the Sin of Conformity ſeems to ſome. I askt Bp. *Morley* the ſame queſtion when he forbad my preaching, before the ejecting Act; and he bid me read *Bilſon* and *Hooker*: I told him that was not now to do: and in both of them I found the Principles which are made the cauſe of my Silencing, my greateſt Crimes, and in one of them worſe. He then told me, *If God would not give me his Grace he could not help it*: And yet moſt of theſe men are againſt *fatal, reprobating, neceſſitating Decrees.*

The impoſing Papiſts uſe men worſe: Of whom will you pardon a Fable.

A *Bee* and a *Flie* were catcht together in a Spiders Web: The Spider when they were tired with ſtriving, claimed them both for her Food, as a puniſhment for breaking into and troubling her Web: And againſt the Bee ſhe pleaded that ſhe was a hurtful Militant Animal, that had a Sting; and againſt the Flie that ſhe was noiſome and good for nothing. The Bee anſwered that her mellifying Nature and work was profitable, and Nature had armed her with a Sting to defend it. And the Flie ſaid, as ſhe did little good ſo ſhe did little harm, and could make her ſelf no better than Nature had made her. And as to the Crime alledged againſt them, they both ſaid, that the Net was made by a venomous Animal, ſpun out of the Air and the Venom of her own Bowels, made for no uſe but to catch and deſtroy the Innocent, and they came not into it by malice, but by ignorance and miſtake, and that it was more againſt their Will than againſt the Spiders, for they contrived not to fall into it; but ſhe contrived to catch them; and that it was not to break the Net that they ſtrove, but to ſave their Lives. The Maſter of the Houſe overheard the Debate, but reſolved to ſee how the Spider would judge, which was quickly done without more words; ſhe took them for Malefactors, and killed them both. The Maſter of the Houſe ſo diſliked the Judgment, that he ordered that for the time to come, 1. The Bees ſhould be ſafely hived and cheriſhed. 2. And the Flies, if not very noiſome, ſhould be tolerated. 3. And all Spiders Webs ſwept down.

I need to give you no more of the Expoſition of it, than by the *Spider* I mean the Papal noxious Canon-makers, and that by the

the *Net* I mean their unneceſſary and enſnaring Laws and Canons, which are made to catch and deſtroy good men, and are the way to the Inquiſition, or *Bonner*'s Coal-houſe, or *Smithfield* Bonefires. But I muſt deſire you not to imagine that I ſpeak againſt the Laws of the Land.

§ 27. As to the Concluſion of his laſt Chapter, I ſhall now add no more but this: If what I ſaid before and to Mr. *Hinkley* ſatisfie him not, of what Religion and Party both ſides were that began the War, and Mr. *Ruſhworths* Collections, and other Hiſtories of former Parliaments be not herein uſeful to him, let him but ſecure me from burning my Fingers with Subjects ſo red hot, by mens miſinterpreting and impatience, and I will (God willing) give him ſo full proof, that (to ſay nothing of latent Inſtigators and conſequent auxiliaries on either ſide, nor of the King himſelf, whoſe Religion is beyond diſpute,) the parties elſe that begun the War in *England* did differ in Religion; but as A. Bps. *Laud*, and *Neal*, and *Bromhal*, and ſuch others, and A. Bps. *Abbot* and *Williams*, and Bp. *Bilſon*, on the other ſide; and as Dr. *Mainwaring*, *Sibthorp*, &c. on one ſide, and Mr. *Ri. Hooker* and ſuch on the other ſide differed. And if my proof be confutable I will not hereafter undertake to prove that *Engliſh* is the language of *England*.

But my Bargain muſt be thus limited. 1. I will not undertake that from the beginning there was no one Papiſt on the Kings ſide, or no one Presbyterian on the Parliaments: I could never yet learn of more than one in the Houſe of Commons, and a very few Independents, but I cannot prove that there was no more.

2. You muſt not put me upon ſearching mens hearts: I undertake not to prove what any mans heart in *England* was; but what their Profeſſion was, and what Church they joined with in Communion.

3. And you muſt not equivocate in the uſe of the name [*Presbyterian*,] or [*Nonconformiſt*,] and tell me that you take ſome A. Bps. and Bps. and ſuch Divines as *Ri. Hooker*, and *Bilſon*, and Bp. *Downame*, the Pillars of Epiſcopacy and Conformity, for Presbyterians.

And if it may be I would beg that of you, that you will not take the long Parliament for Presbyterians and Nonconformiſts, who made the Acts of Uniformity, the Corporation Act, the Militia

Militia Act, and those against conventicles, and for banishment from Corporations, &c. Notwithstanding their high Votes about the Succession and Jealousies of Popery, and that which they said and did hereupon: For I confess if it be such Nonconformists or Presbyterians as those that you mean, I'le give you the better. And I must also desire that you call not the next Parliament, which consisted most of the same Men, Presbyterians or Nonconformists; nor the other since them? Or at least that hereafter before we dispute we may better agree of the meaning of our terms.

And I declare to the Reader, that nothing in all this Book is intended against the Primitive Church-Government or Episcopacy, nor against the good Bishops, Clergy, Councils, or Canons, which were many; nor against King, Parliament, Magistracy, the Laws, or Liturgy, or Church Communion; nor against our peaceable and patient submission where we dare not practically obey: But only against the diseases and degeneracy of Bishops, Clergy, Councils, and Canons, and those dividing practices, by which they have for 1200 Years and more been tearing the Christian World into the Sects of which it now consisteth; and against the whole ascendent Change from the Primitive Episcopacy to Papal maturity: and against our swearing, Subscribing, declaring, covenanting, professing, and practising, where we understand not the Imposers sense, and are unwilling by our private Interpretations to deceive them, and where we are persuaded that it would be heinous sin to us, not meddling with the case of Lawmakers or Conformists, who have no such fears, but think all good.

Chrysostome (before cited) in *Act.* 1. *Hom.* 3. *p.* (*mihi*) 472. speaketh harder than I ever did: [ὐκ ἄλλως λέγω, &c. which *Erasmus* translateth, [*Non temere dico, sed ut affectus sum & sentio; Non arbitror inter Sacerdotes multos esse qui salvi fiant, sed multo plures qui pereant.* His reason is the same which some give why they think most Physicians kill more than they cure, because there is so much Wisdom, Goodness, Watchfulness, and Diligence required to their Calling, which few of them have.

Luther is much sharper than I ever was, when he saith, [*Hieronymus & alii Patres vixerunt in temporali Successione Ecclesiæ, expertes Crucis & persecutionis. Episcopi enim jam tum cœperant crescere & augeri opibus, existimatione & gloria in mundo: Et plerique*

rique etiam tyrannidem exercebant in populum cui præerant, ut testatur historia Ecclesiastica: Pauci faciebant sua Officia, &c. Loc. Com. 4. Class. p. 79, 80.

Et Cap. 27. p. 48. de Synodis. *In posterioribus Conciliis nunquam de fide, sed semper de opinionibus & quæstionibus disputatum* (after the first) *ut mihi Conciliorum nomen pene tam suspectum & invisum sit, quam nomen Liberi arbitrii.*

What *Melancthon* thought of the Papal design of magnifying Councils, and pleading the necessity of uninterrupted Succession of Episcopal Ordination, see in his Epistles, especially of the Conference at *Ratisbone*.

Dr. *Henry Moore* in his *Mystery of Iniquity* saith, p. 132. ["That Principle tends to the ruining of Faith, which sup- "poseth that without right Succession of Bishops and Priests, "there is no true Church, and therefore no true Faith: and "that this Succession may be interrupted by the Misordination "or Misconsecration of a Priest or Bishop, the Persons thus or- "dained being Atheists or Jews, or ordained by them that are "so---- As if a man could not feel in his own Conscience whe- "ther he believed or not the truths of holy Scripture, without "he were first assured that he was a Member of that Church, "that had an uninterrupted lawful Succession of the Priesthood "from the Apostles times till now.

Perhaps *Episcopius* and *Curcellæus* will be more regarded. Read that notable Preface of *Curcellæus* to *Episcopius* Works, *p.* 12, 13. [*Resp. Experientiam docere nullas unquam Controversias de Religione inter Christianos exortas auctoritate synodali feliciter terminatas fuisse---& certiorem multo pacis viam esse*----- Next he shews how little good even the *Nicene* Council did, and how much worse things were after: *Hierome* saying, that the whole World was Arian, And *Constantius* reproaching *Liberius* for being with one man against all the World: The Vulgar *Dicterium* being, *Omne Concilium parit Bellum.* Whence he gathers that Councils, such as the World hath hitherto had, *non esse idoneum componendis Religionis dissidiis Remedium: Et quamdiu illud usurpabitur perpetuas in Ecclesia &* Republica *turbas fore.*

Episcopii & præcipuorum emicuit fides & animi magnitudo, quod ne promisso quidem solutionis ejusdem quo antea fruebantur stipendii, induci potuerint ut se ad silentium quod imperabatur servan-

 dum

dum obſtringerent, etiamſi nonnulli in magna rei familiaris anguſtia verſarentur.

So copious and ſharp is *Epiſcopius*, Qu. 52. p. 56. b. in maintaining that the Magiſtrate hath no Authority to forbid ſacred Aſſemblies to tolerable Diſſenters, and that Miniſters and People forbidden them muſt hold on to the death, that I will not recite the words, but deſire his Admirers to read them.

An

An Account to Edward *Lord Bishop of* Cork *and* Rosse *in* Ireland, *of the success of his Censure of* Richard Baxter *in* England: *Detecting his manifold Untruths in matter of Fact.*

§ 1. TO give my Character of you whom I know not, as you do of me, is none of my work: But 1. Your *Stile* alloweth me to say, that by it you seem to me to be a man of Conscience, fearing God. 2. And yet your *Matter* assureth me, that you speak abundance of Untruths confidently; I suppose, partly by not knowing the persons and things of which you speak; and partly by thinking that you ought to believe the false Reporters, with whom you are better acquainted.

§ 2. The strait which you cast us into is unavoidable: Either we must seem to own all the false Accusations brought against us, which will hurt others far more than us; or else we must deny and contradict them, and that will pass for an intolerable addition to our guilt, and we shall be supposed such intemperate, fierce abusive Persons as you describe me, while you think we give you the Lye, or make you Slanderers. But we cannot cure your Misresentments, but must be content to bear your Censures, while we call you not Lyars, but only acquaint you with the truth.

§ 3. For my own part my final Judgment is so near, and I am conscious of so much evil in my self, that I have no reason to be hasty in my own Vindication, but much reason to take all hints and helps for deeper search, and will not justifie my Stile. And God knows I am afraid lest selfishness or partiality should hinder

me from finding out my ſin: and I dayly and earneſtly beg of God to make it known to me, that I may not be impenitent: But either Prejudice, Converſe, or ſomwhat elſe, maketh a very great difference between your Judgment and mine, of Good and Evil: And I cannot help it: If I err it is not for want of willingneſs to ſee my Errour, and openly retract it; nor for want of an ordinary Diligence to know the Truth.

The Sum of our difference, as far as I can underſtand you, is in theſe particulars.

I. Whether there be no ſin impoſed by the Laws or Canons on Miniſters and People here?

II. Whether it was well done by the Biſhops and other Clergy-Men to do what they did to cauſe thoſe Laws, which ſilenced the whole Miniſtry of *England*, unleſs they would conform to all things ſo impoſed in the Act of Uniformity; and actually ſilenced about 2000, and made thoſe other Laws againſt their Preaching to more than Four, and againſt coming within Five Miles of Corporations, and ſuch others, as adjudge Nonconformiſts to Gaols and Ruine; and whether the Clergy do well ſtill to urge the Execution of thoſe Laws, and are guiltleſs of the doleful Diviſions of this Land, and danger of its Relapſe to Popery?

III. Whether it be unpeaceable for a Nonconformiſt after 17 years ſilent ſuffering, to tell his Superiors why he dare not conform, when he is by them importuned to it? And to write a Confutation of a multitude of Volumns of falſe Accuſations brought to juſtifie the Executions?

§ 4. If you think you have proved all thoſe Impoſitions ſinleſs which I have mentioned in my firſt *Plea for Peace*, I think you might as well have ſhortly ſaid, [*We Biſhops are of ſo much Wiſdom and Authority, that you muſt hold them lawful, becauſe we ſay ſo.*] And muſt all be ruined that would not be ſo convinced? But if any of thoſe Impoſitions prove to be ſin, and ſo great ſin as we cannot chuſe but think they are, is it a greater fault to name them (when importuned) than to impoſe them? And a greater fault to feel, and ſay we feel, than to ſtrike or wound men?

If we had taken it to be our Duty to have called thoſe Clergy-Men to Repentance, which we think are ignorantly undoing themſelves and the Land, how ſhould we do it without naming

naming their Sin? Yea, and the greatneſs of it? And if we think it our Duty to deprecate our Deſtruction, and beg of you to ſpare our Lives or Conſciences, how can we do it without telling what we ſuffer? If it be well done of you, and be no perſecution, but your Duty for the Churches good, (as no doubt the Executioners think) the Hiſtory is your praiſe, and you need not extenuate the Fact: Valiant Souldiers glory in the multitudes they kill: Had you ſilenced the other 7000 that conformed, when you ſilenced but 2000, your Victory had been the more famous. Some think thoſe that are here againſt your ways, are not half the Land; were it murdering of one man, that another is judged for, it were not unpeaceableneſs to ſay, that he deſerveth to be hanged: But the judge deſerveth praiſe if he condemn an hundred ſuch. But when thoſe men who ſhould be the tendereſt Peace-makers, and skilfulleſt therein, ſhall be the men that bring ſuch a Land as this into the Caſe that we are in, and will not be intreated, nor by any Experience be perſuaded to conſent to its Relief, I know not how to ſhew mercy to the Land or them, but by perſuading them to repent. And if all ſin were made a matter of Controverſie, and many learned men were for it, this would not alter the Caſe with me. If I may compare great things with ſmall, who ſinned more? The *Iriſh* for murdering 200000, or Sir *John Temple*, Dr. *Henry Jones*, the E. of *Orery*, for recording and reporting what they did? Was it the ſin of the *Savoyards* and others to kill and ruine the Proteſtants in *Piedmont*? Or of *Perrin*, and Sir *Sam. Mooreland* to write the ſtory? Did *Thuanus*, *Davilah*, &c. ſin in recording the *French* Maſſacre? Or the *French* in doing it? Is it the *French* Proteſtants now that are criminal for deſcribing and complaining of their Sufferings? Was *John Foxe* the Malefactor for writing the Sufferings of the Proteſtants under a lawful Queen? This day came out (*Mar.* 10.) a Narrative from *Briſtol* how they are crowded in the Gaol on the cold ground, *&c.* Is the Report the Crime? Do you find a Juſtification in humane nature of ſuch terms as theſe, [*You ſhall ſuffer whatever we will inflict on you, but ſhall not tell any that you are hurt, or who did it, or why?*]

§ 5. I have told the World ſo often over and over, that it is not all the Conformiſts, no nor all the Biſhops that I impute our Sufferings to, that I muſt ſuppoſe you to underſtand it, ſpecially when the Prefatory Epiſtle of the Book which you fall upon tells,

tells it you of many Bishops by name. Therefore when *p.* 68. you say, [*I apply to you more than once*, 1 Thes. 2. 15. *They please not God*, &c.] and add, [*I believe in my Conscience he is mistaken.*] Either by [*to us*] you mean, all the Conformists or Bishops, and that is *not true*, as the words tell you: Or you mean, [*Us that procured or own, and execute the aforesaid silencing, afflicting Acts:*] which your words seem to mean. And then I do but say, Oh! What may temptation bring even good mens Judgment to? Is the silencing of 2000, the afflicting of many times more of the Laity, the Jealousies, Distractions, and Dangers of this Land, so small a matter, or so good, that *God is not displeased with it?* And can you in *your Conscience* own what the Bishops did towards it? No wonder then if Ceremonies be called *things Indifferent*. Certainly *this cannot* be *Indifferent*? It is a most *meritorious* or *excellent* work, or else a *heinous Crime*: It is either such a Cure as the cutting off a Cancerous Breast, or else if it be a sin, it must be as great as contributing to the endangering of as many score Thousand Souls as 2000 Ministers were likely to have helpt to save, and to the corrupting of the Church, and the Introduction of Popery. And few Christians think that *Nathan* sinned by unpeaceableness more than *David* by Murder and Adultery, though but once; or *Samuel* more than *Saul*; or the Prophet that reproved him more than *Jeroboam*; or Christ *Matth.* 23. more than the Pharisees; yea, or than *Peter*, *Mat.* 16. when he said, *Get behind me Satan, thou savourest not the things that be of God*; or *Paul* more than *Peter*, *Gal* 2. or than the Jewish Teachers, whom he called the *Concision* & *Dogs*; or *John* than *Diotrephes*, &c.

Guilt is tender, and they that think God is of their Mind when he is silent, *Psal.* 50. 21. will think men should be so too. And man dare not bid defiance to God, and openly proclaim a War against him, and therefore hath no way to sin in peace, but by a conceited bringing the Mind and Law of God to his. What sin is there that Learned Men father not on God: And then they must be praised and not reproved, and then it's worse than unpeaceable to aggravate that which they say God owneth; such men as I, would think it scarce credible that the *Spanish* Inquisition, the *French* Massacre, the Powder-Plot, the Murder of 200000 in *Ireland*, the Perjuring of a Nation, the silencing of Thousands of faithful Ministers, should have one word of Justification

fication ever ſpoken for it. But we are miſtaken: No doubt men can write learned Volumes to defend any of theſe; and if one do but ſay, *They pleaſe not God*, men may be found that can ſay, [*I believe in my Conſcience that you are miſtaken, and ſpeak unpeaceably: God is pleaſed with it all.*] Sure the day of Judgment will be much to juſtifie God himſelf, who is thus ſlandered as the Friend of every mans Sin. What wonder is it if there be numerous Religions in the World, when every ſelfiſh man maketh a God and a Religion of his own, fitted to his Intereſt and Mind? But when all men center onely in one God, and bring *their* Minds to *his*, and not conceitedly *his* to *theirs*, we may yet be One.

And if we could make men know, that *God is not for them*, and accepteth not of a Sacrifice of Innocent Blood, however men think that they do him *good Service*, yet they would not have this known: It's long ſince unhumbled Sinners turned Church-Confeſſion into Auricular; If *Saul* do ſay at laſt, *I have ſinned*, he would yet be honoured before the People. But the time is near when thoſe that honour God he will honour, and thoſe that deſpiſe him ſhall be lightly eſteemed.

Few men living can eaſier bear with others for different forms and Ceremonies than I; but I take not the ſilencing and ruining of 2000 Miniſters for Ceremonies (were that the worſt of it) to be a Ceremony.

§ 6. *Pag.* 69. You ſay, *We are not all of one mind yet*: A ſad word from a Biſhop. Do you think that any two Men on Earth are of one mind in all things? Were thoſe agreed whom *Paul* perſuadeth, *Rom.* 14. to *receive each other, but not to doubtful Diſputations*, and not to *judge* or *deſpiſe* each other, (much leſs to ſilence, impriſon, and deſtroy.) We are agreed in all that is conſtitutive of Chriſtianity, and agreed that all Chriſtians ſhould love others as themſelves, and do as they would be done by. I confeſs if you have ſuch eminent *Self-denial*, as to be willing, if ever you differ from the publick Impoſitions, about the lawfulneſs of any one thing, to be not only caſt out of your Lordſhip and Biſhoprick, but to be ſilenced, impriſoned and deſtroyed, I cannot accuſe you of *Partiality* but of *Errour*. I have known too many Conformiſts who needed no Biſhop to ſilence them, (they never preached.) But that will not juſtifie their deſires that others be ſilenced.

I have

I have oft enough told you in how many things the Conformists are disagreed: I now say the Bishops themselves are not agreed of the very *Species* of the *Church of England:* To say nothing of their disagreement of the *Constitutive, national Head* or *Governour*; they are not agreed, *whether it be only a part of an universal, humane, political Church, subject to an universal humane supream Power, who hath the right of Legislation and judgment over them, or whether it be a compleat national Church of it self,* a part only of the universal as Headed by Christ, but not as by Man, or as humane Politie, having no foreign Governour, Monarchical or Aristocratical, (Pope or Council.)

Overdoing is *illdoing* and *undoing*. He that would make such a Law of Concord, as that none shall live out of Prison who are not of the same Age, Complexion, Appetite, and Opinion, would depose the King, by leaving him no Subjects. The Inquisition is set up in Love of Unity: But we know that we shall differ while we know but in part: Only the perfect World hath perfect Concord. I greatly rejoice in that Concord which is among all that truly love God. They love one another, and agree in all that is necessary to Salvation: The Church of the Conformists is all agreed for *Crossing* and the *Surplice*, and for the *Imposed Oaths, Professions and Covenants:* Oh that all our Parishioners who plead for the Church were agreed that the *Gospel is true*, and that Christ is not a Deceiver, and that Man dyeth not as Dogs, but hath a Life of future Retribution.

§ 7. *P.* 69. Asking, [*Were not almost all the* Westminster *Assembly Episcopal Conformable men when they came thither?*] He can say, [*No, not in their hearts, as appeared by their fruits.*] And he cites some words of the sense of the Parliament, *Jun.* 12. 1643.

Ans. 1. See here a Bishop that knew the hearts of hundreds of men, whom he never saw, to be contrary to their Profession and constant Practice.

2. And he can prove by their reporting the Parliaments words what was these Ministers own Judgment.

3. And he can prove by those words in *Jun.* 1643. what was their Judgment a Year or two before, and is sure that the *Scots* Arguments did not change them.

4. And he can prove that those are no Episcopal Conformists who are for the ancient Episcopacy only (described by Bishop *Usher*,) and

and take the *Engliſh* frame to be only lawful, but not *unalterable*, or *beſt*. And if really he do take him to be no *Epiſcopal Conformiſt*, who is for enduring any way but their own, it is he and not I that gave them ſo bad a Character: It is he and not I that intimateth, that thoſe moderate Conformiſts who had rather Church-Government were reformed, than ſuch Confuſion made by ſilencing and hunting Chriſtians, are at the Heart no *Epiſcopal Conformiſts*: Their Hearts I confeſs much differ from the Silencers and Hunters.

§ 8. He maketh me a falſe Hiſtorian for *fixing the War on the Eraſtian Party in Parliament*. *Anſ.* Did I lay it only on the Eraſtians? Have I not undeniably proved that the War here began between two Epiſcopal Parties? Of which one part were of A. Bp. *Abbots*, Mr. *Hookers*, and the generality of the Biſhops and Parliaments mind, and the other of Bp. *Lauds*, *Sibthorps*, *Maynwarings*, *Heylins*, A. Bp. *Bromhalls*, &c. mind: And the firſt ſort ſome of them thought Epiſcopacy *jure Divino*; but the *Engliſh* Frame not unreformable: And the other ſort thought it was but *jure humano*, and theſe were called by ſome Eraſtians. Let him give me leave to produce my Hiſtorical proofs, even to ſingle men by name, that the *Engliſh* War began between theſe two Parties, and I defie all his falſe Contradiction: Only ſuppoſing, 1. That I ſpeak not of the King, nor of the War in *Ireland* or *Scotland*. 2. That I grant that the Nonconformiſts were moſt for the Parliament, and the Papiſts moſt againſt them.

But when I have ſaid ſo much to Mr. *Hinkley* already to prove this, did this Lord Biſhop think to be believed without confuting it?

§ 9. But it tranſcendeth all bounds of Hiſtorical credibility, that he anſwereth this by ſaying, [*He and all his Abettors muſt know the Catalogues of that Parliament, and that Aſſembly are ſtill in our hands, the Copies of their Speeches, and Journals of their Votes*, &c.] *Anſ.* They are ſo to the Shame of ſuch Hiſtorians. You have many of them in *Whitlocks* Memorials; I knew ſo great a number my ſelf of the Parliament, Aſſembly, and Army, as makes me pitty the Ignorant World, which is abuſed by ſuch Hiſtorians as you and yours.

§ 10. As for your aſſuring me that *you look one day to anſwer for all you ſay*, it minds me of the words of your Dr. *Aſheton*,

Chaplain to the Duke of *Ormond*, who *(as going to the Bar of God) undertakes to prove, that it is through Pride and Covetousness that we conform not.* The Inquisitors also believe a day of Judgment. And what is it that some men do not confidently ascribe to the most holy God?

§ 11. Your praises of me are above my desert: I am worse than you are aware of: But mens sins against Christs Church and Servants in *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* are never the less for that.

§ 12. You shew us that you are *deceived* before you *deceive*: You do but lead others into the way of falshood which you were led into your self, when you say, I am [*said to have asserted, that a man might live without any actual Sin.*] A Lord Bishop (*Morley* p. 13.) told it you, and you a Lord Bishop tell it others, and thus the poor World hath been long used; so that of such Historians men at last may grow to take it for a valid Consequence, [*It is written by them*: Ergo *it is incredible.*] I tell you first in general, that I have seen few Books in all my Life, which in so few Sheets have so many Falshoods in matters of Fact done before many, as that Letter of Bishop *Morley*'s; which upon your Provocation I would manifest, by Printing my Answer to him, were it not for the charges of the Press.

2. And as to your Instance, the case was this: Dr. *Lany* impertinently talkt of our being *justified only by the Act of Faith, and not the Habit*: I askt him whether we are unjustified in our sleep? which led us further, and occasioned me to say to some Objection of his, that *men were not always doing moral Acts good or evil:* and thence, [*that a man is not always actually sinning*, viz. *In a mans sleep, he may live sometimes and not actually sin; as also in an Apoplexy and other loss of Reason.*] Hence the credible Bishop *Morley* printed that I said, *A man may live without any actual Sin.* Yea, and such other Reasons are given for his forbidding me to preach the Gospel. And now another pious L. Bp. *going to answer it at Judgment*, publisheth it as from him. O what a World is this, and by what hands are we cast down? Is my Assertion false or doubtful? Dr. *Bates* and Dr. *Jacombe* who were present are yet both living. By such men and means is the Church as it is: Arise O Lord and save it from them.

§ 13. You tell me, as Bp. *Morley*, of being the *top of a faction of my own making, neither Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent*,

dent, or Erastian. *Ans.* So, to be against all Faction is to be the top of a Faction: I am neither an Arian, nor a Sabellian, nor an Apollinarian, nor a Macedonian, nor a Nestorian, or Eutychian, or Monothelite, or a Papist, *&c.* Conclude *ergo* I am the top of a new Heresie, and silence and imprison me for it, and your Diocesane Conformity will be past all suspicion (even at the heart.) But you will one day know, that to be against all Faction, and yet to bear with the Infirmities of the weak, and love all Christians as such, is a way that had a better Author.

§ 14. *P.* 73, 74. As to your extolled Friend a *Nonconformist*, who you say, told you that [*I am not able to bear being gainsaid in any thing, for want of Academick Disputes*, &c.

Ans. 1. Was your great Friend so excellent a man, and was it a good work to silence him, with which in your Conscience you think *God is pleased?*

2. Now you name him not, he cannot contradict you: Mr. *Bagshaw* said something like it of Mr. *Herle*, Prolocutor of the Assemblie, which his Acquaintance contradict.

3. I justifie not my Patience; it is too little: But verily if you had silenced me alone, and Gods Church and Thousands of Souls had been spared, I think you had never heard me twice complain. Judge you whether I can endure to be gainsaid, when I think there are Forty Books written against me by Infidels, Socinians, Papists, Prelatists, Quakers, Seekers, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Sabbatarians, Separatists, and some Presbyterians, Independents, Erastians, Politicians, *&c.* which for the far greatest part I never answered, though some of them written by Prelatists and Papists have spoken fire and Sword: Nor to my Remembrance did any or all these Books by troubling me ever break one hour of my sleep, nor ever grieve me so much as my own sin and pain (which yet was never extream) have grieved me one day. Alas Sir! How light a thing is the contradiction or reproach of man who is speaking and dying almost at once?

§ 15. *P.* 75. As to my *Political Aphorisms* I have oft told you I wish they had never been written: But all in them is not wrong which Bishops are against. The first passage challenged by your Bishop *Morley* is, *My calling a pretence to unlimited Monarchy by the name of Tyranny*, adding my reason, *because they are limited by God who is over all.* Ministers were never under Turks thought worthy of punishment for such an Assertion: But Bi-

ſhop *Morley* is no Turk. If Monarchs be not limited by God, they may command all their Subjects to deny God, or blaſpheme him, to take Perjury, Murder, and Adultery, for Duties: and they are unwiſe if ever they will be ſick, die, or come to Judgment.

§ 16. You ſay, [" *I was told by a Reverend Prelate, that at* " *the Conference at the* Savoy, *Mr.* Baxter, *being demanded what* " *would ſatisfie him, replied, All or Nothing: On this I reflected* " *on what that grave Divine told me.*]

Anſ. Alas good man! if for all other your hiſtorical notices you are faln into ſuch hands, what a maſs of Untruths is in your Brain? But why will you diſhonour Reverend Prelates ſo much as to father them on ſuch? I never heard the queſtion put [*What will ſatisfie you?*] nor any ſuch anſwer as *All. Nothing*: When the King commiſſioned us to treat of ſuch *Alterations as were neceſſary to tender Conſciences*, the Biſhops, 1. Would not treat till we would *give them in writing all that we blamed in the Liturgy, and all the Alterations we would have, and all the additional Forms we deſired.* 2. When thus conſtrained, we offered theſe on ſuppoſition, that on Debate much of it would be denied us, or altered; but they would not vouchſafe us any Debate on what we offered, nor a word againſt our *additional Forms*, *Reply*, or *Petition for Peace*. 3. To the laſt hour they maintained, that *No alteration at all was neceſſary to tender Conſciences.*] And ſo they ended, and the Convocation doubled and trebled our Burden, and the Biſhops in Parliament together.

Once Biſhop *Couſins* deſired us to lay by *Inconveniences*, and name only what we took for *downright Sin*. I gave him a Paper deſcribing *Eight ſuch*: We did but begin to debate one of them, (*Caſting ſuch from the Communion of Chriſts Church that dare not take the Sacrament kneeling, though they be miſtaken*) and our time ended.

Dr. *Pierce* undertook to prove it a Mercy to them to deny them the Sacrament; and he made a motion to me, that he and I might go about the Land to preach men into ſatisfaction and Conformity: I asked him how I could do that when they intended to ſilence me? For though I ſcrupled not kneeling at the Sacrament, if they made any one Sin the condition of my Miniſtry, I ſhould be ſilenced, though they abated all the reſt. It may be this went for [*All or Nothing.*] And I am ſorry that

the

the Bishops be not of the same mind: St. *James* was, that said, *He that breaketh one is guilty of all*: And Christ was, who said, *He that breaketh one of the least of these commands, and teacheth men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of God.*

So that it was not *All Inconveniences*, but *All flat Sins* that we craved in vain to have been exempted from: Much less was it the *Establishment* of all that we proposed to have been *treated* of, openly professing our selves ready to alter any thing amiss or needless upon treaty, and supposing there would be many such words: But they would not touch our offered additions, nor entertain any treaty about them.

And now pitty your self who have been drawn to believe such Reverend Prelates as you say, and pitty such as your Writings will deceive.

§ 17. That you take it to be contrary to a Christian temper to be sensible of the Sufferings of the Church, and to name and describe the sin that causeth them, and that but in a necessitated Apology for the Sufferers, is no wonder, the Reasons and your Answer I gave you before § 4. and 5. I think it no breach of Peace with Persecutors or Silencers, to tell them what they do, especially when the Sufferers are feigned to deserve it all; and not to sin and that deliberately, is made a sin deserving all that we suffer and the Nation by it.

§ 18. But *p.* 77. tells us yet more whence your Errours come, even by believing false Reports, and then reporting what you believe. You say, [*Some People have talked of a Combination or Pact amongst themselves, that except they might have their own Will throughout, they would make the World know what a breach they could make, and how considerable they were.*]

Ans. 1. Do you not think that *Rogers*, *Bradford*, *Philpot*, and the rest, did so in Qu. *Maries* days, and that it was they that made the Breach by being burnt? What is it that such Historians may not say? So *Luther* was taught by the Devil, *Bucer* was killed by the Devil, so was *Oeclampadius*; *Calvin* was a stigmatized Sodomite, and what not: And even the most publick things are yet uncertain before our Eyes: *Godfrey* killed himself: The Papists had no Plot: The Presbyterians have a Plot against the King: The Nonconformists silenced themselves: And did not the Citizens of *London* burn their own Houses? When you that are a Bishop cite other great Bishops for such things as

you

you do, may it not come in time to be the *Faith of the Church*, and thence to be *neceſſary* to all.

2. But how do you think all theſe that were ſcattered all over *England*, and knew not one another by name or Dwelling, ſhould ſo conſederate?

3. Do but think of it as a man. There were Nine or Ten Thouſand Miniſters that had conformed to the Parliaments way in poſſeſſion: They were all to conform or be caſt out. The Book and Act of Uniformity came not out of the Preſs till about that very day *Aug.* 24. Neither Conformiſts, nor (after) Nonconformiſts could ſee it, but thoſe in or near *London*: What time was there to tell them all over *England* in one day? How knew we who would conform and who would not, when Nine Thouſand were equally in Poſſeſſion? If we had written to them all, would not One Thouſand of our Letters have detected it? Or at leaſt ſome of thoſe that conformed, with whom we prevailed not?

4. What was it that moved them all to this Confederacy? To ſuffer Ruine in the World? To *make themſelves conſiderable you ſay, and ſhew what a Breach they could make?* And for what? *Unleſs they might have all their own Wills?* And what was their Will? Was it to be Lord Biſhops? Or domineer over any? Or to get great Benefices? I think no high-way Robbers do any Villanies meerly to ſhew what miſchief they can do, much leſs ruine themſelves to ſhew that they can do Miſchief by Suffering. Some ſuch thing is ſaid of ſome odd Circumcellians that they killed themſelves to make others thought their Perſecutors: But Perſecution was more hated then than now. Did the former Life and Doctrine of theſe Two Thouſand men ſignifie a Spirit ſo much worſe than the reſt?

5. And do you think that the other Seven Thouſand or Eight Thouſand that conformed did conſederate beforehand to conform? How could they do it who declared Aſſent and Conſent to every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book which they never ſaw, unleſs they conſederated at a venture, to do whatever was impoſed? And if Seven Thouſand could agree without conſederating, why not Two Thouſand? I could not then have my Poſt Letters paſs without Interception? And it's a wonder that no Letter of this Confederacy was taken.

And I'le tell (not you, but thoſe that believe me) how far we were from it. When we were all caſt out and ſome new mo-

tion

tion was made for our ſervice, one weak man moved here, that we might draw up a conſenting Judgment to how much we could yield, that we might not differ. I anſwered that it was not our buſineſs to make a Faction, or to ſtrengthen a Party; nor were we *all of one judgment* about *every Ceremony*, and therefore no man muſt go againſt his judgment for a Combination with the reſt: If they would abate but ſo much as any one mans Conſcience would be ſatisfied in, that one man muſt ſerve the Church accordingly. And if any were taken in, the reſt would rejoyce.] This Anſwer ſilenced that motion, and I never heard any move it more: And I am fully aſſured there was never ſuch a Combination.

But with this exception: How far any thought the Covenant bound them againſt our Prelacy I cannot tell. Thoſe that I convers'd with ſaid, it bound them to no more than they were bound to before. But I confeſs we did all confederate in our Baptiſm, againſt willful ſin: And I know of no other Confederacies but theſe: which indeed was enough to make all men forbear what they judged to be ſinful.

§ 19. You add, [" *But yet it is not fair to over-reckon knowingly, and in ordinary courſe Two Hundred in the ſum, as Mr.* Baxter *and others do*, p. 155, 210. *thereby to ſwell the account to the greater* odium, *by complaining roundly Two Thouſand: This I muſt conclude to be done knowingly, for ſomtimes he only mentions One Thouſand Eight Hundred*, p. 151, &c.]

Anſ. I am perſuaded that it is not knowingly that you ſpeak ſo much beſides the truth; but for want of knowing what and whom you talk of. I never medled with gathering the number, Mr. *Calamy* did, and ſhewed us a Liſt of 1800, upon which I long mentioned no more, and ſeldom ſaw him afterward: But Mr. *Ennis* who was more with him, aſſuring me that they had after an account of at leaſt 200 more, who were omitted; I ſometime to ſpeak the leaſt mention the 1800, and ſometime ſay about 2000, and by his laſt account that was the leaſt. Yet with a Lord Biſhop that knoweth nothing of all this, I *knowingly over-reckon*: But if *God be pleaſed* with their ſilencing, why do you take this ill?

§ 20. The next and great Accuſation is my *extenuating the Biſhops Clemency, and aggravating our Sufferings, and that againſt my Conſcience I impute to the Biſhops that bloodineſs which they never*

wer intended but abhor. And he will not believe what I say of the death of any by Imprisonment or want.

Ans. The good Lady that pittied the Beggars when she came in out of the Frost and Snow, when she had warmed her self, chid them away, and said, it was warm enough. I could name you those in *London*, that travelled out of the North in great want, and took up with such cold Lodgings here in great want of all things, that they were past cure before their misery was known. How many poor Quakers have dyed in Prison many know: It's like you never heard of the death of Mr. *Field*, a worthy Minister, in the *Gate-house*; nor of Mr. *Thompson* in the noisome Prison at *Bristol*, nor of Reverend Mr. *Hughes* of *Plimouth*'s Death, caused by his Prison sickness; perhaps you never read the Life, Sufferings, and Death of excellent *Joseph Allen* of *Taunton*: I will not be the gatherer of a larger Catalogue, But I believe some others will. But these you *know not of.*

§ 21. The words in my Book which I speak argumentatively, shewing clearly whither their cause will lead them, if they trust to bring us to Unity by force, you unworthily feign that I speak as accusing the Bishops Inclinations. My Argument was, *If you think by violence to effect your ends, it must be either by changing mens judgments, or by forcing them as Hypocrites to go against their judgments, or else by utter destroying them till there are no Dissenters: But none of these three ways will do it*: Ergo *Violence will not do it.* 1. I prove that force will not change their Judgments. 2. I prove they are such men as will rather suffer death than sin against their Consciences; and so less Sufferings which cure not do but exasperate the Disease. 3. I prove that if, when less doth no good, you would destroy them, that would not do your work but cross it. And doth this signifie that I charge the Bishops with bloody purposes? They openly tell us that it's *punishing* us that must bring us to Concord. I tell them, *Lesser will not do it, and greater will but hurt themselves.* A man would think that I hereby rather infer that Bishops *will not be bloody*, than that *they will*, when I argue *ab incommodo.* Truly Sir, I see nothing in your Book which tempted me to lament, that I mist the happiness of your Academical Education or Disputes: Nor do I envy those that now enjoy it. God save his Church from the worser part of them.

§ 21. You say, *p.* 79. You *must needs look on my aggravating*

my

my own and the Dissenters Sufferings beyond Truth, you are sure beyond Probability, to have proceeded from want of temper. As for saying that some *have lived on brown Bread and Water.*

Ans. I find still that our difference lieth in matter of Fact, done in the open sight of the World: And if it were whether we are *English*-men, I have no hope of ending it! O what is History! My own Sufferings by them are very small, save the hindering of my Labour: Leave to work is all the Preferment that ever I desired of them: What I have had hath been against their Wills, who have called out for my greater restraint. God hath enabled me by the Charity of others to send some small relief to a few of those whose Case he will not believe. Some of them have Seven or Eight Children, and nothing at all of their own to maintain them, and live in Countries where scarce two Gentlemen of Estates within their reach do befriend them; and the People are generally poor; and many of these have none to preach to, being not permitted, And when they attempted to meet with some few secretly, to fast and pray in some case of need, have had their few Goods carryed away by Distress. Good Alderman *Ashhurst*, now with Christ, took care of many, and hath shewed me Letters and Certificates of undoubted credit, in the very words which I named. One is now near us, that was put to get his Living by Spinning. Mr. *Chadwick* was the last of whom I read those words in a just certificate, that he and his Children had long lived on meer brown Rye Bread and Water. It is now above a dozen Years since Dr. *Vermuxden* told me that Mr. *Matthew Hill* was his Patient, with Hydropical swell'd Legs, with drinking Water and using answerable Food through meer Poverty: But God turned it to good; for necessity drove him (when a little strengthened) to *Mary-Land*, where he hath been almost the only able Minister they have. We that know them our selves, and beg Money to relieve them, are supposed to be Lyars: for telling that which all their Neighbours know. Through Gods Mercy few in *London* suffer so much, (though divers are in great streights.) But great numbers in the Countrys who live among the poor, had not some of them now and then a little Relief from *London*, were like to beg for Bread, or fall into mortal Diseases by Food unfit for Nature. Even in *London* they that knew Mr. *Farnworth*, Mr. *Spinage*, and some others, and how they lived and dyed, understand me, I'le name Mr. *Mar-*

* Dead since the writing of this.

tin formerly of *Weedon*, * very poor in *London*, to tell you of your impartiality; though he lost one Arm in the Kings Army, he had not a day abated him in *Warwick* Gaol for preaching.

§ 22. As to his repeating all my mention of their dealings, and my blaming the Bishops at the *Savoy* for our present divisions, and my aggravating the evils which Violence will produce if they trust to that way, I judge it all necessary to be spoken: Unknown sin will not be repented of nor forborn; nor unknown danger prevented; nor the unknown needs of the Peoples Souls relieved.

He asketh, *Is this the way to be at Peace with us?* I answer, There is no other way: What Peace can we have with them that think they are bound to silence us; and keep us six Months in Gaol for every Sermon, and so on for the next, and for the next? Or to pay 40 *l.* a Sermon, and to banish us five Miles from Corporations, and must not be told of any such thing? He was not unpeaceable that said, *He that seeth his Brother have need and shutteth up the Bowels of Compassion from him, how dwelleth the Love of God in him?* Nor for saying, *He that hateth his Brother is a Murtherer*: Nor Christ for telling us how he will judge them that did not relieve and visit him in his little ones; and how he will use him that beat his Fellow-Servants. It is with you and not with your sins that we would have peace. Not only *Massonius* and *Platina*, but even *Genebrard*, and *Baronius* speak far sharplier of the faults of many Popes themselves, and all Historians of their Prelates, and yet are taken to be peaceable men. Either those that I mentioned will repent here or hereafter, and then will say far worse of themselves than I do. And may I not foretel it them, when it is but in necessitated deprecation of the miseries of the Land?

§ 23. One of their Champions wrote that he was *not bound to deny his own Liberty, because others would pievishly take scandal at it.* I shewed the sinfulness of that Conclusion, and that a mans Liberty often lay in as small a matter as a game at Chess, a Pipe of Tobacco, or a Cup of Sack: and most scandal is taken by pievish persons: and yet even a pievish mans Soul is not to be set as light by as such things. Christ and *Paul* made more of Scandal: And this very arguing of mine is numbred with my unpeaceable distempered words.

§ 24. As to his talk about our Controversies of passages in Conformity

Conformity, he confeſſeth that he hath not read my *Plea for Peace*, in which I have partly opened them: And much leſs what I have ſaid ſince of them to divers others; and I confeſs I have neither mind or leiſure to ſay all over again in Print, upon the occaſions of ſuch words as his, which have been oft anſwered.

§ 25. I named the Martyr-Biſhops *Hooper*, *Ridley*, &c. as Nonconformiſts to the Laws of their Perſecutors, to ſhew that ſuch Sufferers leave a ſweeter name than their Perſecutors; and he feigneth me to have made them Nonconformiſts to our Laws, and ſaith, [*Ingenuity and Chriſtian Veracity would bluſh to own this Art.*] Thus ſtill falſe Hiſtory is that which aſſaulteth us.

But I humbly ask his Lordſhip, 1. Whether he think that *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, and *Latimer*, were more for Conformity than *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, and *Hooker*, and *Abbot*? And 2. Whether he will ſo far reproach theſe men as to ſay, that *Jewel*, *Bilſon*, and *Hooker* would have conformed by approving that which they moſt expreſly wrote againſt? I have oft enough tranſcribed their words.

§ 26. To ſhew that ſince my expulſion I drew not the People of *Kiderminſter* from the Biſhops, I ſaid that I [*never ſince came near them, nor except very rarely ſent them one Line*; which he pretends I contradict, by ſaying, *I ſent them all the Books I wrote.* One might have found hiſtorical errours enough in his words without a Rack or Quibble. 1. Sure Books are ſomwhat rarelier written than Letters. 2. An ordinary Wit would have underſtood that I ſpoke of *one Line* of Manuſcript, or one Letter, and not of Printed Books, I delivered them to Mr *Simmons*, or their Neighbours to ſend them without Letters. And few of thoſe Books were written before this Apology.

§ 27. As a Self-contradicter he ſaith of me, *ſomtime I am againſt all Subſcribing*, as *p.* 60, 113. &c. *and ſometimes not.*

Anſ. Still untruth! *P.* 60. The words are [*If men were not driven ſo much to ſubſcribe and ſwear as they are at this day.*] Reader, is it true that this is *againſt All Subſcribing*?

Pag. 113. The words are, [*If we had learned the trick of ſpeaking, writing, and ſwearing in univerſal terms, and meaning not univerſally but particularly, as many do, we could ſay, or ſubſcribe, or ſwear as far as you deſire us.*] And [*Take off the penalty*

of subscribing, declaring, crossing, &c. *what good doth subscribing a Sentence which he believeth not?*] Is this *against All Subscribing?*

§ 28. Whether to profess our tenderness of other mens Reputation, and yet to name the nature and aggravations of the sin which we fear our selves, when we are importuned to it, be contradictory, let the impartial judge.

§ 29. *P.* 92. He saith, as my judgment, [*To subscribe and declare, that it is not lawful on any pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King, or that an unlawful Oath cannot bind men to unlawful Actions, is Perjury, some of the greatest that Hell suggesteth.*] *Ans.* Not one true word? I believe all this to be as he saith: Both in my first and second *Plea for Peace*, I have largly told him what it is, and what it is not which I own; but he hath seen neither, and yet feigneth me to say or hold what I have so oft renounced.

§ 30. *P.* 94. He might have known how oft in Print I have retracted the Book called, *The Holy Common-Wealth*, wishing the Reader to take it as *Non-scriptum*: Yet he saith, [*as far as is generally known I have not done it.*] And how should I make it generally known more than by oft Printing it?

§ 31. *P.* 95. He pittieth me for calling the Author of the *friendly Debate*, the *Debate maker*: And I pitty *England* for such pittiers.

§ 32. *P.* 96. Whereas the Convocation hath imposed on all Ministers a Profession of *undoubted certainty of the Salvation of dying baptized Infants*, without excepting those of Atheists or Infidels, I ask whether all the *young, unstudied* sort of Ministers have arrived at this *certainty* any more than I, and how they came by it? and crave their Communication of the ascertaining Evidence. And what doth his Lordship but pretend that I call the *Convocation* these *young, unstudied men*, as if they had made this Rubrick for none but themselves?

§ 33. And he hath found another fault which exceedeth all, and that is, the Title and Dedication of my *Methodus Theologiæ*; where I say, that I dedicate it not to the *slothful, hasty, tired Sectaries*, &c. but *to studious, ingenious, humble*, &c. *young men, as being the persons that are above all others born, disposed, consecrated to Truth, Holiness, and the Churches Peace*, &c.] Exceeding bad!

Will.

Will you hear the proof that this is exceſſive Pride? 1. *The Book in the front indirectly and ſlily calls the Reader, ſlothful, raſh, fooliſh,* &c. *Anſ.* Is this true? 1. It is only thoſe that I would *not* have to be the Readers. Yea, 2. Only thoſe that I ſay it is *not dedicated to.*

And do you think there are none ſuch in the world? Will not his foreſaid *Debater*, and Dr. *Parker*, and Dr. *Sherlock*, and abundance more, tell you that the Nonconformiſts are many of them ſuch, and will you now deny it? If not, am I bound to dedicate my Book to ſuch? By what Obligation?

But he ſaith ſo *voluminous* and *emboſt* a Title will deter the Readers. But do you not know the *Dedication* from the *Title*, only becauſe it is printed on the Title Page? Is that unuſual?

But the odious Arrogance followeth, [*Could any thing eaſily be ſaid with more* (*appearance of*) *Arrogance; in the very Title Page too, than that his Book is above all others of the ſame Subject,* (*I know not how otherwiſe to interpret his* ſupra omnes, *viz.* Methodus Theologiæ Chriſtianæ,] *&c. framed, diſpoſed and hallowed to the propagation and growth of Holineſs, to the Peace and Honour of the Church.*] *I will now for ever acquit him of hypocritical Modeſty.*

Anſ. I deſire Mr. *Morrice* to compare this Ld. Bp's Tranſlation with that overſight of *Theodoret*'s words which he faſteneth on in me. What if I had ſaid that this Biſhop knoweth not how to interpret a plain Latine Sentence, as he ſaith it of himſelf? That which I moſt expreſly ſay of *pious, ingenious Youth*, he feigneth me to ſay of *my Book*. Reader, look on the Book and judge whether *Methodus*, the Nominative Caſe ſingular, agree with *natæ, diſpoſitæ, conſecratæ*, the Dative Caſe, when *Juventutis Parti ſtudioſæ, ſedulæ*, with many other Datives, went before it: There are no leſs than Twelve Adjectives joined to *Parti* in the Dative Caſe, and yet he conſtrueth the three laſt a agreeing with the very firſt Title-name in the Nominative Caſe. And is this the way to make me lament my want of his Academical Education? Is it any wonder if theſe men prove us Liars and proud, and if they ſentence us for leſſer Crimes?

Yea, here he concludeth that I write [*ſo previſhly, ſo raſhly and unconſtantly to my ſelf, ſo blindly, as if willfully blinded and not penitent of my own guilt, and ſo arrogantly, and diſdainfully,* &c.] You have heard the proof.

§ 34.

§ 34. *Pag.* 99. He proveth my *unpeaceableness* from the *Petition for Peace*, and *Additions to the Liturgy*: The Crime here is, [*There's not one Office, no not one Prayer of the old Liturgy*, and is stiled *A Reformation of the Liturgy, and little more than a Directory.*

Anſ. O miſerable World! What cure is there for thy Deceits? This good man talks as he hath heard, and ſo all goes on.

But 1. he knoweth not it ſeems what Title our Copy had, but judgeth by that which ſome body printed.

2. It ſeems he knoweth not that this Draught was only offered to debate, expecting abundance of Alterations: We openly declared that it was done on ſuppoſition of obliterating and altering all that they had any juſt exception againſt, were it but as *needleſs*. And for the clauſes, [*Theſe or the like words*] we profeſt, that we expected an Obliteration of them, but had rather the Biſhops did the impoſing part, if it muſt be done, than we.

3. He knew not it ſeems that ours were offered but as additional Forms, that ſuch of them as both ſides agreed on, might be mixt as *Alias*'s with the old Liturgy. And doth his Lordſhip then exclaim with reaſon, that [*Not one Office, not one Prayer of the old was in*, when all (after correction) was to be in, and none left out. Oh what is Hiſtory! and what men are its corrupters?

And (that his work may be homogeneal) *p.* 100, 101. having recited my Commendation of their Liturgy as better than any in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, he addeth as an Accuſation, [Yet *p.* 219. *he complains of ſuch failings in it, that* IT IS A WORSHIP *which we cannot in faith be aſſured God accepteth.*]

Reader, This is one of the leſſer ſort of deceiving Accuſations. I ſaid that (among greater ſins which we fear in our Conformity) we fear leaſt by Aſſent and Conſent to all things contained and preſcribed. *&c.* we ſhould be guilty of juſtifying all the failings in that worſhip, and alſo of *offering to God a Worſhip that we cannot in faith be aſſured that he accepteth.* This Lord ſo worketh it, that the Reader who peruſeth not my words would verily think that I had ſaid this of the Liturgy in the ſubſtance of Worſhip there preſcribed, which I ſaid only as to the things which we dare not conform to: And I explained it by ſaying, [*We dare not juſtifie the beſt Prayer we put up to God in all things.*] *E. g.* To dedicate Infants to God without their Parents expreſt Dedication, or conſent, or their promiſe to educate them as Chriſti-

Christians, and this upon the false covenanting of Godfathers that never owned them, nor ever mean to educate them as promised, (as is known by constant experience, neither they nor the Parents intending any such trust in the undertakers) and to dedicate them by the sacramental Sign of the Cross, or a badge of Christianity, and to refuse all that will not be thus baptised. This we fear is a worship that God will not accept. But is this therefore said of the substance of the Liturgy?

And if the Lord Bp. be wiser or bolder than we, and be beyond all such fears, should he not suffer Fools gladly, seeing he himself is wise? And if he like not our fearing an Oath, Subscription, Declaration, Covenant, or Practice, which he thinks to be true and good, and we think to be false and evil, why may he not endure our timorousness while he may rush on himself and venture; should he not rather pitty us, while St. *Paul* saith, *He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not in Faith.*

§ 35. *P.* 108. He questions whether their communion be my practice: and *p.* 110. giveth me two friendly Councils. 1. To peruse my Books, and retract what's amiss. 2. To tell the World now my sober Thoughts, what I could and would do were I to begin the World again.

I heartily thank him for his Counsel, for it is good and honest. But alas, what a thing is it to write of things which men know not! 1. He knoweth not that I have retracted much already; partly by disowning, and partly by large Obliterations: Of the first sort are my *Aphor.* of Justification, and my *Polit. Aphorisms* (though not all that's in them.) Of the 2d he may see many and large Obliterations in my *Saints Rest*, my *Key for Catholicks*, &c.

2. He seemeth not to know what bloody Books, to prove me one of the worst men living, their Church Advocates have written against me, fetcht mainly from these retracted Books and Words. Nor how they that commend *Augustine*, reproach me as mutable for those Retractations.

3. It seemeth he knoweth not that I have already performed his second Advice, in my *Cure for Church-Divisions*, my *Second Plea for Peace*, (about *Government*) Yea, Bishop *Morley* before the King, Lords, and Bishops at *Worcester-house*, speaking of Ceremonies and Forms, caused my *Disputations of Church-Government*, produced and said, *No man hath written better than Mr.* Baxter, (as if it were against my self.) And in Doctrinals, my

my *Cathol. Theol.* and *Methodus Theol.* and *Christian Directory* have expressed my maturest, calmest thoughts. But he that consults me to it knows not that it is already done. And more for Revising and Retractation I would do, if necessity did not divert me, even the want of time and strength.

§ 36. *P.* 115. You say. [*That Reverend and great man Bp.* Morley *tells us* [*the generality of Nonconforming Divines shewed themselves unwilling to enter on Dispute, and seemed to like much better another way, tending to an amicable and fair compliance, which was wholly frustrated by* ——— *a certain persons furious eagerness to engage in a Disputation.*] *This was it seems the sense of both sides at that time.*]

Ans. How far from Truth? It was the sense and Resolution of the reconciling Party, called by them Presbyterians: We all desired nothing but an amicable Treaty— We were promised by ——— they should meet us half way. When we met, Bishop *Sheldon* declared the Agreement of his Party, that *till we had brought in all our Exceptions against the Liturgies, and our additional Forms, they would not treat with us.* Mr. *Calamy*, Mr. *Clark*, and others, would have taken that as a final Refusal, and meddled no more, lest Dispute should do more harm than good: I was against such an untimely end, and said, *They will report that we had nothing to say: It's better let the case be seen in writing, than so break off.* The rest wrote the *Exceptions* about the Liturgies: some Agent of the Bishops answered them without the least concession for alteration at all. I wrote a *Reply*, and the *Additional Forms*, and a *Petition to the Bishops*, and they would treat of never a one of them: But at the end, put us to dispute to prove *any Alteration necessary*, they maintaining *that none at all was necessary to the ease of tender Consciences.* (Of which before.)

§ 37 I had thought to have proceeded, but truly the work which the Bishop maketh me is so unpleasant, almost all about the truth or Falshood of notorious matter of Fact, that I have more Patience to bear his Accusations (whatever his learned Friend said of my impatience) than to follow him any further at this rate. But whereas he saith, that [*some will think that many things in his Book want truth.*] I am one of those, and leave it to the Readers Judgment whether they judge not truly: And whereas he lays so much stress on Bp. *Morley*'s words, if any Printer shall be at the charge of Printing it, I purpose while he and the Witnesses are yet alive, to publish the Answer to his Letter, which I cast by to avoid Displeasure. And if they will still be deceived, let them be deceived. I cannot help it.

It is no wonder that he that is described, *Joh.* 8. 44. should carry on his Kingdom accordingly in the World: But must his Dial be set on the Steeple of Christs Church, and have a consecrated Finger for its Index? O lamentable Case!

FINIS.

DIOCESAN CHURCHES

NOT

Yet Discovered in the Primitive Times.

OR

A Defence of the Answer to Dr. *Stillingfleets* Allegations out of Antiquity for such Churches.

Against the Exceptions offered in the Preface to a late Treatise called a Vindication of the Primitive Church.

WHERE

What is further produced out of Scripture and Antient Authors for Diocesan Churches is also Discussed.

LONDON,

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst* at the Bible and three Crowns at the lower end of *Cheap-side* near *Mercers Chappel* 1682.

Errata.

PAge 59. l. 4. r. Sirmond. p. 67. l. 33. r. to. p. 76. r. Euodius. p. 80. l. 14. r. oratorum. p. 86. l. 16. r. Congregations. p. 87. l. 27. r. Bishops. p. 95. l. 2. r. διαπίπτουσι, p. ult. l. 9. r. less. besides mis-accenting some Greek words, and other mis-pointings.

THE

PREFACE.

DIſſenters *are accuſed of* Schiſm *by ſome of this Church, both theſe and the other are branded not only as* Schiſmaticks, *but as* Hereticks *by the* Papiſts; *who upon this account judge us unworthy to live, and had actually deſtroyed* both *together, if* God *in Mercy had not diſcover'd their deviliſh* Plot. *The diſcovery gave them ſome interruption, and put them upon an after-game, to retrieve what had miſcarryed. And this was ſo to* divide *us, as that* our ſelves *ſhould help them in their deſign to* ruine us all, *when they had leſs hopes to do it* alone. *In purſuance hereof ſuch influence they have had upon too many, as to raiſe in them a greater averſation to* Diſſenters *than to* Papiſts. *Theſe the* Conſpirators *count their own, and think they may well do ſo, ſince*

they are too ready to concurre with them in their deſign to exterminate thoſe, who are true Proteſtants in every point, *and differ no more from this* Church *than thoſe in* France *do, who by the* ſame *Counſels are at this time in extreme danger to be utterly extirpated. Others are ſo far prevailed with as to make uſe of one of the ſharpeſt weapons they have againſt diſſenting Proteſtants, and that is the charge of* Schiſme, *lately renewed and re-inforced.*

In theſe hard circumſtances, while we do what we can againſt the common Enemy, *we are put to ward off the blows of ſuch as (notwithſtanding ſome preſent diſtemper) we will count our* Friends. *Amongſt other expedients, ſufficient to ſecure us againſt this attaque, it was thought not unuſeful, to anſwer the* allegations out of Antiquity, *concerning two points, wherein only the* Antients *were made uſe of to our prejudice, viz.* 1. *For* Dioceſan Churches, *and then* 2*ly. Againſt* the Election of Biſhops by the people *in the primitive times. Something was performed and publiſhed in reference to both theſe in a late diſcourſe. One half*

of which, where the latter is discussed, concerning the popular Elections of Bishops, *hath yet passed without any exception that I can see or hear of; yet this alone is enough to defend us against the aforesaid charge: For those who will not make the* primitive *Church* Schismatical, *must not condemn any as* Schismaticks *for declining such* Bishops *as that Church would not own.*

Against the former part of the Discourse, concerning Diocesan Churches, *some exception hath been made, but very little; a late* Author *in his* Preface *to a Treatise of another Subject, hath touched about* 5 *pages in* 40. ***but so*** *as he hath done them no more harm, than* ***another, who*** *to find one fault therein, runs* ***himself into two*** *or three, about* μύειν, *render'd* indefinitely *according to the mind of the* Author *who uses it, and the most common use of it.*

I disparage not the Gentleman's *Learning who attaques me in his Preface, he shews that which, (with answerable care and Judgment,) might be serviceable in a cause that deserves it. But much more than he shews, would not be enough to support what he would establish. And he might have forborn the vi-*

vilifying of those, who are known to be Masters *of much more valueable Learning, than appears in either of us. The neglect of some accurateness in little things, remote from the merits of the cause, in one who is not at leisure to* catch flies, *is no argument that he is destitute of Learning.*

I complain not of his proceeding with me; but am obliged by him, that he treats me not with so much contempt as he does others, who less deserve it. I wish he had dealt more temperately with M. B. it would have been more for his reputation, and no prejudice to his undertaking; a good *cause, when it hath a* sufficient *Advocate, does not need any undecent supplements.*

After I have cleared my Discourse from this Gentleman's *exceptions, I thought it not impertinent to shew what in reason cannot be counted competent proofs of* Diocesan Churches; *that if any will pursue this debate farther, instead of opposing us, they may not* beat the Air, *and amuse those that enquire after truth; with what is insignificant. Withal I have given an account of what other allegations out of Scripture and Antiquity this Author*

hath brought in other parts of his Treatise for such Churches; and shew'd that there is no evidence in them, as to the purpose they are alledged for.

In short, I find nothing in this Author, *or any other before him, which may satisfie a judicious and impartial man, that in the* two first Ages *of Christianity any Bishop had more than one particular Church or Congregation for his proper charge; or that in* the third Age, *there was any Bishop which had a Church consisting of more than are in some one of our* Parishes, *unless it was the Church of* Rome *(nor is there sufficient evidence produced for that:) Or that in* the middle of the fourth Age *there were 4 Churches, each of which comprised more than could assemble in one place (though if they had contained more, that might be far enough from making them Dioceſans;) Or that afterwards, within the* time of the four first General Councils, *where there were several Churches belonging to one Bishop, he did exercise jurisdiction over them alone, or only by himself and his Delegates. It will be time enough to censure us as* Schismaticks *for declining* Dioceſan Churches, *when they have made it appear,*

pear, that there was such, in the best ages of Christianity: (which not appearing, the censure falls upon the primitive *Christians, from whom it will* slide *of upon themselves.) If they will forbear us, till this be performed, we need desire no more. Unless we may prevail with those who sincerely profess themselves* Protestants, *to regard the securing themselves and their* Religion *from the destructive designs of the* Papists, *more than* those things *which are not* properly *the concern either of* Protestant *or of* Religion.

(*As for those who prefer the* Papists *before* Dissenters, *and revile these as worse, though they differ in no one point of Religion from other true* Protestants: *We need not wonder if we meet with no better treatment from them, then from declared Papists; since by such preference they too plainly declare the* Protestant Religion *to be* worse than Popery, *in their account. The following sheets have lain by me many Months, and had done so still; but that the importunity of some, and the misrepresenting of my silence by others, forced me to publish them.*

Dioceſan Churches not yet diſcovered in the Primitive times.

TO ſhew that many Presbyters in one Church was not enough to prove it a *Dioceſan*, I made it manifeſt that it was uſual in the antient Church, to multiply Presbyters, *beyond what we count neceſſary*; (not beyond what is neceſſary, as it is too often miſrepreſented:) For this I offer'd two Teſtimonies, one aſſerting it to be ſo in the *Firſt Age*, the other in the *Fourth*, and thought theſe ſufficient, if they could not be denied, (as they are not) to evince it to have been ſo in the *Third*: For who can reaſonably ſuppoſe, but that had place in the *Third*, which was uſual both in the Ages *before* and *after*? The firſt was that of *Biſhop Downham*, who ſayes, *at the firſt Converſion of Cities, the number of people converted were not much greater than the number of Presbyters placed amongſt them.* But *this*, its ſayed *can be of little uſe*; 'becauſe, 1. This 'was not the caſe of the Church of *Carthage*, it was 'not a new converted Church, but ſetled long before, 'and in a flouriſhing condition.

The Church of *Carthage* by the fierce perſecutions in *Cyprians* time (which is the time we ſpeak of) was brought ſo low, and reduced to ſo very few, as if it had been but new converted, and how was it *in a ſetled and flouriſhing condition*, when it was ſo lamentably waſted, and ſtill harraſſed one year after another? or who can be-

lieve it, that reads *Cyprian* lamenting; *Pressuræ istius tam turbidam vastitatem, quæ gregem nostrum maxima ex parte populata est, adhuc & usque populatur*, and that they were *positi inter plangentium ruinas, et timentium reliquias, inter numerosam & languentium stragem, et exiguam stantium paucitatem?* (a) Was not this much the case of the *Apostolical Churches*, unless this of *Carthage* was worse, and so less for our Author's advantage? Or if this were otherwise, the Churches in *Nazianzen's* time were not *newly converted*, but *setled* long before, and in a *flourishing condition*; which yet cannot be denyed to have had more Presbyters than *we count needful*. So that this was the practise in every condition of the Church, whether flourishing or not.

(a) *Lib. 4. Ep. 4.*

2. 'He sayes, many more Presbyters may be ordain-'ed in a City, than is necessary for the first beginning of 'a Church, with respect to future increase. *&c.*

And who will question, but the many Presbyters in the Church of *Carthage* were for *future increase* both in City and Country? So that herein the case is not different; And the design of that number of Officers might partly be for other Congregations, (Episcopal Churches, though not Diocesan) to furnish them with Officers. This is apparent afterwards in the practice of the *African Churches*, who when a new Church was erected, supplyed it with a Bishop or other Assistants from places better stored with Officers; And it is exemplyfied particularly (as we shall see hereafter) in the provision which St. *Austin* made for *Fussala*.

'He sayes further, the multitude of Presbyters belong-'ing to one Congregational Church, might be occasi-'on'd by the uncertain abode of most of the *Apostles* 'and their *Commissioners*, who are the Principal, if not 'the only Ordainers of Presbyters mentioned in Scrip-'ture.

But

But herein he does but gueſs, and had no reaſon to be poſitive, unleſs the *Apoſtles* and their *Commiſſioners*, (as he calls them,) had been then the only Ordainers, which he will not venture to affirm, knowing what evidence there is againſt it.

'Laſtly, he ſayes, if this opinion of *Biſhop Downham* 'had any certain ground in Antiquity, we ſhould pro- 'bably hear of it with both eares, and we ſhould have 'it recommended upon antienter Authority than his.

This of *Biſhop Downham* hath certain ground in the beſt antiquity, if the *New Teſtament* be ſuch; where it is plain there were many Presbyters in diverſe Churches, ſuch as are not yet, nor ever will be proved to be *Dioceſan*.

To that of *Nazianzen*; he ſayes, 'it hath received 'its anſwer, and adds, he that cannot anſwer it to him- 'ſelf, from the great difference between the condition of 'the Church in *Cyprian*, and in *Nazianzen*'s time, hath 'a fondneſs for the Argument.

This is the anſwer it received, *Pag.* 51. and this difference was thus expreſſed a little before; 'But that any 'Church fixt and ſetled, having its Biſhop alwayes pre- 'ſent, ſhould multiply Presbyters *beyond neceſſity*, in the 'circumſtances of the Primitive Chriſtians before *Con- 'ſtantine*, is altogether incredible; for the neceſſary ex- 'pences of the Church were very great, the poor nu- 'merous, the generality of Chriſtians not of the Rich- 'eſt, and the Eſtates they had being at the diſcretion of 'their enemies, and ruin'd with perpetual perſecution, *&c.* He ſayes, multiplying Presbyters *beyond neceſſity*, and *without neceſſity*; while he alters my words ſo as to change the ſenſe, he diſputes againſt himſelf, not me; But this looking more like an Argument than any thing before, I ſhall take a little more notice of it. 1. Is not all this applicable to the Churches in the *Apoſtle*'s times,

when it cannot be denyed *Presbyters* were multiplyed beyond what we count neceſſary ? *The poor numerous, the generality of Chriſtians not of the Richeſt,* and *the Eſtates they had being at the diſcretion of their enemies, and ruin'd with perpetual perſecution.*

Further, the Church before *Conſtantine* and *Carthage* particularly, ſuppoſing theſe to be its circumſtances, might have many Presbyters without any great charge: For 1ſt. the Church Stock was reſerved *only* for thoſe in *want*, τοῖς δεομένοις, as is determin'd in one of the *Canons* which paſs for *Apoſtolical*, (b) and the ſame decreed in the ſynod at *Antioch*. (c) *Ambroſe* even in the 4*th. Age*, will have none to have a ſtipend who hath other revennes, *Qui fidei exercet militiam, agelli ſui fructibus, ſi habet, debet eſſe contentus; ſi non habet, ſtipendiorum ſuorum fructu.* (d) And *Chryſoſtom* tells us that in Elections, thoſe of the Competitors that had Eſtates did carry it, becauſe the Church would need to be at no charge in maintaining of ſuch, ἵνα μὴ δέοιτο τρέφεσθαι ἐκ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας προσόδων. 2ly. When they had no Eſtates, and the *Church* could not maintain them, they were to provide for themſelves by ſome honeſt imployment. The Council of *Elvira* allows all ſorts of Clergy men to drive a trade, for their living, provided they did it only in the Province where they lived, (f) and in the 4th. Council of *Carthage* it is ordered, that the Clergy, *though they be learned in the word of God, ſhall get their living by a trade.* (g) and in the next *Canon* that *they ſhall get food and rayment by a Trade or Husbandry*, with this proviſo, *that it be not a prejudice to their Office.* Our *Author* ſayes indeed, (h) *that this is contrary to the uſage of all other Churches*; how true this is may be ſeen by the *Canon* before cited. He ſayes alſo, *that this is forbidden by the* 3*d. Council of Carthage*; but neither is this ſo, that *Canon* adds but another reſtriction, *viz.* that *they get not their livings by*

(b) *Can.* 4.
(c) *Can.* 25.
(d) *Offic. L.* 1. *c.* 36.
(e) *De ſacerd. Ser.* 3 *Pag.* 23. *Edit. Savil.*
(f) *Can.* 19.
(g) *Can.* 51.
(h) *Pag.* 154.

by an employment that is sordid or dishoneſt, where the Latine and Greek both agree in it. 3ly. The Church was to allow none of them, no not *Biſhops* more than *neceſſary*, even after *Conſtantine*'s time. That Canon call'd the *Apoſtles*, and the other *Antioch* forecited, expreſs this in the ſame words, *the Biſhop may have of the Church Stock what is neeedfull, if he be neceſſitous*, τὰ δέοντα εἰ δεῖτο πρὸς ἀναγκαίας χρείας, for *neceſſary uſes*, and theſe are afterwards explain'd *to be food and rayment*. *Zonaras* expreſſes it fully and clearly, whom he that the *Canon* doth not ſatisfie, may conſult.

(i) *can.* 15. *in Cod.* 16.

Having ſhew'd out of *Juſtinian*, that 60 Presbyters belonged to the great Church in *Conſtantinople*, and thence inferr'd they were numerous in *Conſtantine*'s time, the 'number (ſayes he,) was become extravagant in *Ju-*'*ſtinians* time; but what is this to their number in *Cy-*'*prian's*?

He ſhould have asked the *Dean* this, who to prove *Dioceſan* Churches from the number of Presbyters, immediately after Teſtimonies out of *Cyprian*, brings this of *Juſtinian*.

'For this very edict of *Juſtinian* ſhews that this multi-'plying of Church Officers was an innovation, and *there-*'*fore* would have them reduced to the firſt eſtabliſhment.

Juſtinian took order to retrench the numbers of Presbyters, not *therefore* becauſe it was an *innovation*, but becauſe the Church revenue could not maintain ſo many, which is expreſs in the *Novel*.

'But that firſt eſtabliſhment it ſeems admitted great 'numbers, for one Church had 60. *True*; but it muſt alſo 'be noted firſt, that theſe 60 were to ſerve more than 'one Church.

Some may be ready to ask how it can be *true*, that one Church ſhould have 60, and yet more than one had theſe 60 amongſt them. 'For

'For there were three more besides St. *Sophia* to be 'supplyed by these Presbyters. *&c.*

True; but this still confirms what I answer'd to their argument from the multitude of Presbyters, that in the antient Church the Officers were multiplyed *above what we count needful*: For it is not now thought needful that any 3 or 4 Churches in a City, should have 60 Presbyters, 100 Deacons, 90 Subdeacons, Readers 110. *&c.*

'Yet after all, there is no argument to be drawn from 'this number, for these were *Canons* of a particular foun-'dation, design'd for the service of a *Collegiate* Church; 'and no measure to be taken from thence concerning the 'numbers of Presbyters belonging to the Dioceſs. This 'is evident from the Preface of the said *Novel.*

If no argument is to be drawn from this number, why did the *Learned Dean* draw one from it? 2ly. This seems scarce consistent with the former Period: there, these Presbyters were for 3 *or* 4 *Churches*, here they are but for *one Collegiate* Church of which they were *Canons*, and this said to be evident in the *Preface*, where I cannot see it. 3ly. *Since no measure is to be taken from hence concerning the numbers of Presbyters belonging to a Dioceſs*; it seems there may be this number of Presbyters in a place which cannot be counted a *Dioceſs*, (as this one great Church never was, nor can be) and then no argument drawn from the number of Presbyters at *Rome*, *Carthage*, *Edeſſa*, *&c.* will prove a *Dioceſan Church*; for here was the greatest number, which any where we meet with.

Dr. St. to prove *Dioceſan* Churches from the numerousness of Presbyters, mentioned 60 in C. P. in *Juſtinian*'s time; from hence on the by, I thought it reasonable to suppose they were numerous in *Conſtantine*'s time, when yet *Theodoret* sayes, *all the Brethren met together with the Biſhop.* That the number of Presbyters is no

Proof

proof of a *Dioceſan* Church was evinced ſufficiently before: this fell in occaſionally, and was added *ex abundanti*; Yet upon this ſupernumerary ſtragler he turns his main force, ſpending about 12 Pages on it. I am little concerned what becomes of it, ſince the main Hypotheſis is already ſecured by the premiſſes; but that this Gentleman may not quite looſe all his labour, I am willing to looſe a little, in taking ſome notice of it.

'I muſt confeſs that what is added concerning the 'Church of C. P. is ſomewhat ſurprizing, no doubt 'ſayes he, that the Presbyters were *more numerous* in 'C. P.

Indeed it might have been ſurprizing if I had ſaid as he reports me, that they were *more numerous*; but I ſaw reaſon not to ſay ſo, though what reaſon there was to impoſe it on me I know not: I cited *Soc*: miſprinted *Soz.* ſaying, *Conſtantine built two Churches at C. P.*, but laid no ſtreſs on it at all. (k) *It is true*, he ſayes *not that he built no more than two*, but his expreſſion plainly implyes it, and he was concerned if he had known any more to have mention'd it, when in the ſame Line, he ſayes *Conſtantine* intended to make it equal to *Rome*. *Euſebius*'s words agree well enough herewith, he ſayes *Conſtantine adorn'd it*, πλείουσιν, *with more Churches*, and that's true, if he built but *two* more, or any more than was there formerly, or any more than was uſual. And theſe *more* Churches were not in the City, but (as the *Hiſtorian* ſpeaks) partly there, and partly περὶ τὴν ὄψιν, which as the word is uſed, may denote places many Miles diſtant from the City, as the *Gentleman* elſewhere obſerves after *Valeſius*. *Sozomen* ſayes he built πολλὰς, many Churches, (not very many as he will have it) but if he thereby meant more than are named by *Socrates*, we need not underſtand that done before the time *Theodoret* ſpeaks of; Nor ſhould a lax expreſſion be more relyed on,

(k) *Soz. l.* 1. *c.* 12.

on, than one that is punctual and definite; unless we have a mind either to be misled, or to set the two *Historians* together by the ears. *Sozomen* names but one Church more than *Socrates* did, and that not *in*, but a good distance from the City, (70 Furlongs by Land,) and 3 may pass for *many*, when it was a rare thing for any City to have *more than one*. The best Authors, as they sometimes express *very few* by *none*, and a *generality* by *all*; so they express *more than ordinary* by *many*; and *two* or *three such* Churches in one City were more than ordinary at that time, when one City in an Hundred had not *two* Churches, and one in a Thousand had not *three* Churches, that could be styled μέγισται: *all* that *Constantine* built here were *such*, both *Eusebius* his *more*, and *Sozomen*'s *many*, are said, by them to be very great, μέγισται. But no considerable Author that I meet with in that Age, or some Hundreds of years after, names more than two *very great Churches* erected by *Constantine* in that City. And if comparison be made, there is no *Historian* of those times, to be more regarded in matters which concern *C. P.*, than *Socrates* who tells us, that he was born and educated in *C. P.*, and continued there (as an advocate) when he wrote his History.

l. 9. c. 24.

But if we should suppose that *Sozomen* intended more than 3 or 4 Churches, or that the *Emperour* built no more than was requisite, and only consulted conveniency, and design'd not State or Magnificence, (which yet our Author a little after sayes he did; and we know nothing is more ordinary than for great Cities to have more Churches than are needful: it was so in *London* before the Fire, and the retrenching of their number since shews it:) yet this will be so far from proving *Alexander*'s Church in *C. P.* to be *Diocesan*, that it will not prove it greater than some single Congregations: for there were 12 Churches in *Alexandria*, when yet the Church in

in that City adhereing to *Athanasius* consisted of no more than are in some one of our Parishes. For which such Evidence has been brought, as is not yet, nor I think, can be defaced. 'Nor can we imagine that two 'Churches, much less one, could suffice all the Christi-'ans in *C. P.* when the City of *Heliopolis* being convert-'ed to Christianity required more, and *Constantine* 'built several for them, ἐκκλησίας ϑ' κτίσας.

The word *plurally* expressed is much improved by our *Author*, he makes out of it *diverse Churches*, and *all these Churches*, when yet *all these* were but *one* Church, as *Socrates* himself makes it plain a little before *l*; for having related how *Constantine* ordered a Church to be built near the *Oak* at *Mambre*, he adds, that he ordered *another Church* (not Churches) *to be erected at* Heliopolis, ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν κατασκευασθῆναι. And to put it past doubt, *Eusebius* whom the *Emperour* employ'd about those structures, and from whom in all likelihood *Socrates* had the Relation, gives an account but of *one Church* there founded by the *Emperour*, which he calls οἶκον εὐκτήριον ἐκκλησίας *m*, and that it was furnished with a *Bishop*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. So that the Bishop of *Heliopolis* had but one Church for his Diocess, which our *Author* should not be so loath to own, since it cannot be proved that at this time one Bishop in an hundred, had more.

l Soc. l. 1. c. 18.

m l. 3. c. 56. De vitâ Constant.

Valesius (whom our *Author* much relies on), in his *Notes* upon this place, is so far from thinking that *Constantine* built more Churches in *Heliopolis*, that he judges this one at present was not necessary for it, the Town having then no Christians in it: and assigns this as the reason why *Eusebius* speaks of it as a thing unusual, that it should have a Bishop appointed, and a Church built in it. His words are, *Fortasse hoc novum & inauditum fuisse intelligit*, &c. *He may think this new and unheard*

of, that a Church ſhould be built in a City, where as yet there were no Chriſtians but all were alike idolaters. Therefore this Church was built at Heliopolis, *not for that there was any neceſſity of it, but rather in hope that he might invite all the Citizens to the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion.* So that the Biſhop here had none for his Dioceſe but one Church, and that empty, there being then no Chriſtians in that one Pariſh; which yet was all he had to make him a *Dioceſan.*

in lib. 3. de vit. Conſtant. c. 58. p. 235.

The better to confute *Theodoret*, who ſaies (for they are his words, not mine) that *Alexander with all the Bretkren met together*, he endeavours to ſhew the ſtate of that Church about the latter end of *Conſtantine*, &c. this he does here and after by an undue Application of ſome paſſages in *Sozomen.* For the account which that *Hiſtorian* gives of that City is not confined to *Conſtantine*'s time, but reaches beyond it, ay, and beyond *Julian*'s too, which appears, as by other paſſages, ſo by his mentioning the *heathen Temples* in the time of that Emperour. And with reſpect to the time after *Conſtantine* muſt that expreſſion be underſtood, which makes *C. P. to exceed* Rome, *not only in Riches, but in the number of Inhabitants*, otherwiſe it will be apparently falſe. For when *Chryſoſtome* was Biſhop there, about 70 years after (when it is like the number of the Inhabitants were doubled, it cannot be queſtioned but they were far more numerous) he who beſt could do it, reckons the Chriſtians then to be an 100000 *n*; our *Author* will have us look upon the *Jews* and *Heathen* there to be inconſiderable but let us count them another 100000. Yet both put together will fall incomparably ſhort of the number in old *Rome*, which by the computation of *Lipſius* was at leaſt *two millions o.* And in *Conſtantine*'s time *new Rome* was as far ſhort of the old as

n *In Act. Hom. 11. pag. 674.*

o *De Magnit. Rom. lib. 3. c. 3.*

as to its greatneſs in circuit, for whereas *Herodian* declares that *Severus* quite demoliſhed *Byzantium* for ſiding with *Niger*, and reducing it to the *ſtate of a Village ſubjected it to* Perinthus, κώμην δηλαδὴν Περινθίοις δοῦλον εὐθὺς p, we cannot in reaſon ſuppoſe it to be extraordinarily ſpacious; yet as *Zoſimus* reports, all the inlargement which *Conſtantine* gave it, was but the addition of 15 Furlongs, σταδίοις πεντεκαίδεκα q. Now ſuppoſe it was 30 or 40 Furlongs in compaſs before (and ſo larger than one City in an hundred) yet this addition will leave it leſs than *Alexandria*, which, as *Joſephus* deſcribes it, was 80 Furlongs, that is, ten miles in circumference r, yet *Alexandria* was four times leſs than *Rome*, for by *Vopiſcus*'s account, in *Aurelian*'s time, not long before *Conſtantine*, *the walls were made* by him *near* 50 *miles in circuit*. So it will be in compariſon of *Conſtantinople* when firſt built, rather like a *Nation* than a *City*, as *Ariſtotle* ſaid of the other *Babylon*, ἔχει περιγεφύρωμα μᾶλλον ἔθνους, ἢ πόλεως s. If then we will have this paſſage of *Sozomen* to have any appearance of truth, it muſt be extended far beyond *Conſtantine*'s time, when, as *Zoſimus* tells us, many of the ſucceeding Emperours were ſtill drawing multitudes of People to that City, ſo that it was afterwards encompaſſed with walls far larger, πολλῷ μείζοσιν, than thoſe of *Conſtantine* t. And in an Oration of *Themiſtius*, it is made a queſtion whether *Theodoſius junior* did not add more to *C. P.* than *Conſtantine* did to *Byzantium*.

p *lib.* 3. *p.* 68.

q *lib.* 2. *p.* 62.

r *De Bell. Jud. lib.* 2. *cap.* 16.

s *Pol. lib.* 3. *c.* 2.

t *lib.* 2. *p.* 65.

'Many of the *Jews* and almoſt all the Heathen were 'converted and became Chriſtians.

The expreſſion of *Sozomen* does not hinder but as the main body of the *Jews* remained, ſo the numbers of the Heathen might be conſiderable. *Tertullian* ſpeaks of Citizens in his time as if they were *almoſt all Chriſtians*,

u *Apol. c.* 37. *pene omnes cives christiani u*; yet no instance can be given of any one City where the Christians were the major part of the Inhabitants: those that take his words in a strict sense are very injurious to him, and make him speak that which no antient Records will warrant. *Sozomen* also may suffer by straining his expression; but I will not digress to take further notice of what is not material; for I design not, nor have any need, to make any advantage of the numbers of the Heathens in this City.

He tells us of 950 Work-houses whose rents were allowed to defray the Funeral expences of all that died in the City (for so it is expressed in the Constitution, w *Novel.* 43. περὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ὁσίαν τὸ σῶμα θεῖναι w) these being performed with great solemnity, and multitudes of Attendants maintained by those rents for that purx *Nov.* 59. *c.* 2. pose *x*. How this here makes the Christians in *C. P.* to be so very numerous as he would have them, he should have shewed us; I am not yet so sagacious, as to discover it. The number of the Decani was determined y *Cod. de Eccl. Lex.* 4. by *Honorius* to 950 *y*. Our Author thinks it probable they were so many at the first establishment, but there's more ground to believe, they were much fewer in *Constantine's* time; for about 800 were counted sufficient in *Justinian's* Reign, 200 years after, when the City was both larger, and much more populous and z *Novel.* 59. *c.* 2. in its greatest flourish *z*. Those that consider the premisses, may well think, he might have form'd his conclusion in terms less confident, to say no worse of it.

Next he forms an Objection against himself: 'notwithstanding the number of Christians in *C. P.* might 'be much too great for one Congregation, yet the ma'jor part might be *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks*, such as 'came not to the Bishop's Church, and therefore all that

c that adhered to him might be no more than could
c meet in one Assembly.

To which he answers, *that the number of Hereticks and Schismaticks was inconsiderable*, and will not except the *Arians* or *Novatians*. For the *Arians*, he saies, *they had not yet made a formal Separation.*

But if they did not separate themselves, the Church would have them separated, and did exclude them from communion, and withstood *Constantine*'s importunity for their admission, both here and in other places: *Athanasius* was threatned by *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia a*, and banished by the *Emperour* for this cause among others. And *Alexander* being secured by *Arius* his death from admitting him to Communion, was the occasion of this passage in *Theodoret* which gives our *Author* so much trouble. Now the *Arians* being debarred from communion, lessened the Bishop's Church, both here and elsewhere, as much as if they had separated themselves. And they were numerous here, this being the place where they had greatest favour; in *Constantine*'s Edict against the *Hereticks* whose meetings he would have suppressed, the *Arians* were not mentioned when the other are named *b*. *Socrates* writes that the People in this City was divided into two Parties the *Arians* and the Orthodox, *they had continually sharp bickerings*, but while *Alexander* lived the Orthodox had the better; as soon as he was dead (which was * while *Constantine* lived) it seems they appeared equal, for *the contest*, saies he, *was dubious*, ἀμφίρροπος ἦν μάχη *c*. In *Nazianzen*'s time so far they overtopt the Orthodox, that this great *Diocesan* Church appear'd but in the form of a *private meeting*, *held in a very little house*, where he kept a Conventicle with them, ἐν οἰκίσκῳ μικρῷ ἐκκλησιάζων, so *Sozomen d*, and *Socrates* agrees with him in the expression, ἐν μικρῷ οἰκίσκῳ, such a diminutive place seems as un-

a *Soc. lib. 2. c. 17*

b *Euseb. de vita Constant. lib. 3. cap. 62. 63.*

* *Vales observ. in Soc. & Soz. l. 2.*

c *Soc. lib. 2. c. 6.*

d *Lib. 7. cap. 5.*

unproportionable for such a *Diocesan* Church as a *Nut-shell* for *Homer's Iliads*, or *a Key-hole for a Witch*, to use our Author's Elegancies.

As for the *Novatians* to which he will have no more allowed than a *Conventicle*, they were numerous in other places, they had once diverse Churches in *Alexandria*, many Churches in *Rome* and in other places. It is like they were numerous here, for here they had as much favour or more, and longer too, than in the Cities forementioned, here *Socrates* sayes *they had three Churches* e, and if three Churches would but make one *inconsiderable Conventicle*; it is possible the other Orthodox Churches (though he will have them to be many) might be comprized in *one vast Congregation.*

e *Lib.2.cap.30.*

I might observe how much *Sozomen* is mis-represented in what he sayes next of those concerned in the *Edict*, the *Novatians* especially. He speaks not *mincingly* as our Author would have him, but fully that the *Novatians did not suffer much* by the Edict; he does not say *only that it was probable* they suffered little, but sayes this only of a reason himself gives, why they suffered not much. He gives other reasons for it than *the opinion*, *the* Novatians had of that Bishop. He does not say the *other Hereticks were altogether extirpated.* He does not confess that *the* Novatians *suffered the same measure with others every where*, no, nor any where else, it is the *Montanists* that he sayes this of. He *dares to affirm they had a Conventicle* or more, for he affirms they had an eminent Bishop in *C. P.* and were not only *numerous therebefore* the Edict, but *continued so after.* The *Gentleman* was in too much haste here, as himself will perceive, by observing how much his account differs from the *Historians.*

At last he comes to that passage of *Theodoret* which occasioned all these lines, *but* Theodoret *affirms they were*

were no more than could meet in one Church, and that they did actually do so, 'I answer, sayes he, that *Theodoret* 'does not say so, and the passage cited does not con-'clude it.

I did not say *Theodoret affirms they were no more, than could meet in one Church*, but he sayes the same in effect, viz. that *all the Brethren assembled with* Alexander. His words are, *Alexander, the Church rejoycing, held an Assembly with all the Brethren, praying and greatly glorifying God.* The words are plain, and the sense, I take them in, is open in the face of them. Nor do I believe that any disinterested person would put any other sense upon them than this, that *the generality of Christians of which the Church at* Constantinople *consisted, assembled together with their Bishop* Alexander, *to praise God joyfully for their deliverance by the death of* Arius. But he will not have the words *taken in a general sense*, but *will suppose them taken with respect to that particular Congregation, in which* Arius *was to be reconciled.* Yet this supposition hath no ground either in the words, or in the contexture of the Discourse, or any where else that I know of, or our *Author* either; for if he had, we should have heard it *with both ears*, as he speaks elsewhere. He will not have *all the Brethren, to be all the Believers at* C. P. yet he knows that *Brethren* and *Believers* are Synonymous terms both in *Scripture* and *ancient Authors.* And those were the Believers or Brethren of the Church of *C. P.* which had occasion to rejoyce, and that was the whole Church there: as for πάντες, render'd *Universi*, I do not take it *for all and every one* of the Christians there; for in all Assemblies, of great Churches especially, *many* are alwayes absent. He had dealt more fairly with *Theodoret*, if by *all* he would have understood the *generality of Christians adhereing to* Alexander *at* C. P. or the greatest part of them, and about

about such an abatement of the full import of the word, there had been no need to contend; but his restraint of it to a particular Congregation agrees not with the words, nor the occasion of them, nor hath any support elsewhere.

Nor is that better which follows, *unless you will say that with all the Brethren, does not signifie their personal presence, but only their unanimity.*

This looks more like a shift than a plain answer, and therefore he was well advised in not venturing to own it.

'*Theodoret* could not think that all the Beleivers of C. 'P. could come together to the Bishop's Church, for he 'cites a Letter of *Constantine*'s a little after, where he 'gives an account of the great increase of that Church. *In the City that is call'd by my name by the Providence of God, an infinite multitude of People have joined themselves to the Church, and all things there wonderfully increasing, it seems very requisite that more Churches should be built; understanding therefore hereby what I have resolved to do, I though fit to order you to provide* 50 *Bibles fairly and legibly written.*

He does not say an *infinite multitude*, the words of the Letter are μέγιστον πλῆθος, that there was a *very great multitude of Christians* is not denied, nor that he intended to *build more Churches*; but this confirms what is signified before, that these *very many Churches* were not yet built, but only in design, and that with a prospect of Christians there still increasing. And the *Bibles*, if they were intended only for C. P. might be for the future Churches, not the present only.

His Conclusion is, 'where Christians were so multi-'plied that it was necessary to build more Churches, 'and to make such provisions for the multitude of their 'Assemblies, it could not be that they should all make 'but one Congregation. He

He ſhould have concluded that which is denied, otherwiſe all he hath premiſed will be inſignificant, and to no purpoſe: it is granted that all the Chriſtians at C. P. did make more than *one Congregation*, and for their conveniency met at other times in ſeveral Churches. That which is denied is, that the main Body or generality of Chriſtians there could not meet in one Aſſembly, or did not ſo meet at this time with their Biſhop *Alexander*, as to this he hath proved nothing, and therefore did well to conclude nothing againſt that which is affirmed to be the plain import of *Theodoret*'s expreſſion.

And it may be ſuppoſed that *Theodoret*, if he had not expreſſed it, *might well think* (though the contrary be ſuggeſted) that as great multitudes, as *Conſtantine*'s Letters ſignified, might meet together at the Biſhop's Church; for himſelf declares what a vaſt Congregation he preached to at *Antioch*, having an Auditory of *many Myriads f.* I will not ask him what *Euſebius could think*, when he tells us the Chriſtians had μυριάνδρους ἐπισυναγωγὰς, *Aſſemblies conſiſting of Myriads g.* Nor what *Socrates thought*, when he tells us long after, of C. P. that *the whole City became one Aſſembly*, and *meeting in an Oratory*, *continued* there all day *h*, Ὅλη πόλις μία ἐκκλησία ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐυκτηρίῳ γενόμενοι, *&c.* But I would have him tell me how he underſtands that paſſage of *Chryſoſtome*, καὶ γάρ τι τοῦ Θεοῦ χαριτὶ εἰς δέκα μυριάδων ἀρίθμον οἶμαι τοὺς ἐντάυθα συναγομένους τελεῖν *i.* What is the import of theſe words? Do they ſignify that *ten Myriads* were aſſembled in one place to hear *Chryſoſtome?* If ſo, there will be no queſtion but that the generality of Chriſtians might meet in one Church with *Alexander* in *Conſtantine*'s Reign; for that then, (about 70 years before) there was any thing near ſo many Chriſtians as an 100000; adhereing to one Biſhop in this City, cannot with any reaſon be imagin-

f *Ep.* 83.

g *Lib.* 8. *Cap.* 1.

h *Lib.* 7. *cap.* 23.

i *Hom.* 85. *in Mat. Tom.* 2. *p.* 529.

ed.

ed. Or does he mean only, that there were ſo *many Myriads* of Chriſtians contained in that City? If ſo, then he ſaies here no more than in another *Homily* forecited, where the number of Chriſtians in C. P. is computed to be an 100000, reckoning *all beſides Jews and Heathens*. Now if they were no more in his time, they cannot with reaſon be ſuppoſed to have been above half ſo many in *Conſtantine*'s (unleſs any can imagine, that their numbers advanced more in 6 years than in 70, when the ſucceeding Emperours multiplyed the Inhabitants exceſſively, ὑπὲρ τὸν χρείαν, as *Zoſimus* tells us [k], crouding the City ſo full as that they could ſcarce ſtir without danger:) and a great part of theſe were fallen off to *Arius* while *Alexander* was Biſhop: the *Novatians* alſo, were numerous, having ſeveral Churches; and theſe with other Sects being deducted, the Chriſtians there that communicated with *Alexander* will be no more (if ſo many) than belong to ſome one of our Pariſhes.

k Lib. 2.

'It would ſwell this Preface to too great a Bulk, if I 'ſhould anſwer the reſt ſo particularly.

Since he deſigned to be ſo breif, and to have ſo ſhort a Preface, I wiſh he had employed more of it againſt that which is the ſtrength of the Diſcourſe he oppoſes, and of more conſequence to the main Cauſe; and not have ſpent ſo many leaves upon a by-paſſage, for which we have little reaſon to be concerned: for if he could make it appear, that the Chriſtians at C. P. in *Conſtantine*'s time were more than could meet in one Congregation, yea, or in two either; that would be far from proving it a *Dioceſan Church*, unleſs ſome one or two of our Pariſhes can be counted ſo.

Let me add in fine, that our *Author* has done juſt nothing towards the diſproving of what *Theodoret* was alledged for; unleſs he ſhew, that C. P. exceeded *old Rome*,

Rome, was furniſhed with ſuch an infinite number of Chriſtians, ſo many (more than two) magnificent Churches there erected, the 50 Bibles thought needful to be provided, and almoſt all the *Heathen* beſides many *Jews* converted; before *Alexander* (who is ſaid to hold this Aſſembly *with all the brethren*) deceaſed; and ſo unleſs he prove that all this was done (which himſelf I think can ſcarce believe) in leſs than a year. For *Valeſius* (upon whoſe authority this *Gentleman* takes much) proves at large (making it the buſineſs of one of his *Books*) that *Alexander* died (and yet muſt live ſome while after this *panegyrical* Aſſembly) in the year 331. And its manifeſt, that C. P, was not built, nor had that name till 331. For tho' it was building the year before, yet it was not finiſhed till 25 of *Conſtantine*'s Reign (as *Jerome* and others:) and the beginning of his Reign is reckoned from the death of *Conſtantius* his Father, who was Conſul with *Maximianus* in the year 306, and died in the middle of it. There needs not a word more to ſhew that all his diſcourſe on this ſubject is wholly inſignificant, and not at all for his purpoſe, tho' this be the moſt conſiderable part of his Preface.

L. 2. obſerv. Ex Soc. & Soz.

Chronic.

Faſt Conſul.

'This Author gives ſeveral inſtances of ſeveral Biſhops 'being in one City at the ſame time, in anſwer to the 'Dean of *Paul*'s, who affirmed that it was an inviolable 'rule of the Church to have but one, *&c. Jeruſalem* is 'the firſt inſtance, *&c.* I wonder to find a man of Learn-'ing cite this paſſage, than which nothing can be more 'diſadvantageous to his Cauſe.

There is one who I ſuppoſe paſſes for a *man of learning* who for the ſame purpoſe makes uſe of this inſtance, ſince mine was publiſhed; *We have*, ſaith he, *Examples in Eccleſiaſtical ſtory of of two Biſhop's at the ſame time in the ſame See, and yet this was never thought Schiſmatical, when the ſecond was advanced by the conſent of the firſt.*

Thus Alexander *a Bishop in* Cappadocia *was made Bishop of* Jerusalem *while* Narcissus *was living, but very old: and* Anatolius *at the same time, sate in the Church of* Cæsarea *with* Theotecnus, *and this was St.* Austin's *own case, who was made Bishop of* Hippo *while there was another Bishop living l.* He sayes also, *Nothing can be more disadvantageous to my cause than this passage.* If it had been no advantage to my cause, I should have thought it bad enough; but if nothing could be more disadvantageous, I am very unhappy: let us see how it is made good.

l *Defence of Dr. St. p.* 178.

'*Narcissus* having retired, and the people not knowing what had become of him, the neighbouring Bishops ordained *Dius* in his place, who was succeeded by *Gordius* and after by *Germanico*, (it should be by *Germanico*, and after by *Gordius*) in whose time *Narcissus* returned, and was desired to resume his Office, and did so. What became of *Germanico* (he means *Gordius*,) is not said but probably he resigned or died presently.

There is nothing to make either of these probable, it is altogether as likely, if not more, that he continued Bishop there with *Narcissus* for some time; but because *Eusebius* sayes nothing of it, I insist not on it. But besides he tells us, Narcissus *took* Alexander, *into the participation of the charge.* That signifies *Narcissus* was not excluded from the Episcopal *charge*, both had their parts therein. No, but sayes he, Alexander *was the Bishop*, Narcissus *retained but the name and title only*, that is, he was but a Titular, not really a Bishop, and why so? because *Alexander*, sayes he, *joined with him in prayers, and the Historian sayes he was not able to officiate by reason of his great age.* He was not able it may be to perform all the Offices of a Bishop, but what he was able to do no doubt he performed. Now if they must be but *titular* Bishops, who perform not personally all the Offices

fices of a Paſtoral charge (when they cannot pretend λιπαρὸν γῆρας) how many *real* Biſhops ſhall we find in the World? But beſides the *Name and Title*, did he not retain the Power and Authority of a Biſhop? If not, how came he to looſe it? Did he *reſign*, or was he *depoſed*? That he reſigned there is not the leaſt intimation in this *Hiſtorian* or any other; nor any inſtance in the antient Church, that ever any Biſhop diveſted himſelf of all paſtoral *Power* upon this account. To have depoſed him for his great age had been a barbarous Act, and ſuch as the Church in thoſe times cannot be charged with. No doubt but he retained the Epiſcopal power, though through Age he could not exerciſe it in all inſtances; and if he had not only the *Title* but the *Power*, he was really a Biſhop, and there were two Biſhops at once in one Church, and then this inſtance is ſo far from being *moſt diſadvantageous*, that it ſerves me with all the advantage I deſigned in alledging it.

As for the words of *Valeſius* cited by him, if they be taken in the ſenſe which our *Author* would have them, that *learned man* will not agree with himſelf. For but a very few lines before, he ſays, theſe two were *Co-Epiſcopi*, *Biſhops together* in that City, *ſuperſtite epiſcopo adjutor & coepiſcopus eſt adjunctus*, And tho' he ſays (but ſays it doubtfully with a *ni fallor*) this was forbidden at *Sardica* (above 100 years after); yet he adds that, *notwithſtanding it was ſtill uſual in the Church, nihil ominus identidem in eccleſia uſurpatum eſt*, which is all that I need deſire. And afterwards, where *Euſebius* in *l. 7. c. 32.* again mentions two Biſhops in one City, he obſerves, that in one of his Copies, the *Scholiaſt* has this note upon it in the Margin, ἐν ταύτῃ μίας ἐπισκοπῆς δύο προέστησαν, *here alſo there were two Biſhops of one Church.* *Valeſius* adds, *the Scholiaſt underſtands* Alexander, *who was Biſhop of* Jeruſalem *together with* Narciſſus.

The

The next instance is of *Theotecnus* and *Anatolius* who were Bishops of *Cæsarea* together. Against this he hath little to say, I suppose because nothing can be said against it in reason. Only he seems willing that *Anatolius* should pass but as *Episcopus designatus*, whereby if he mean one, who is not yet actually a Bishop, but designed to be one hereafter, as *Eradius* was by *Augustine*, it is inconsistent with what *Eusebius* sayes and himself quotes, but one line before, viz. *that* Theotecnus *ordained him Bishop in his life-time*; for if he was not *actually* Bishop after he was thus ordained, he was never Bishop at all *m*.

m *Euseb. l. 7. c. 32.*

Another instance was of *Macarius* and *Maximus* both Bishops at once of *Jerusalem*.

He would not have *Maximus* to be Bishop while *Macarius* lived, because it is said *he was to rule the Church after his Death.*

But *Maximus* was to govern the Church not only after his death, if he survived him (as he was like to do being much younger) but while he lived; and so did actually together with him, συνιερᾶσθαι, which denotes the exercise of the same Function together *n*: besides the *Historian* sayes, *Maximus* was before this ordained Bishop of *Diospolis*, and if he had officiated at *Jerusalem*, where they were so desirous of him, in a lower Capacity; their kindness to him had been a degrading him; which it cannot be supposed they would either offer, or he yeild to.

n *Soz. l. 2. c. 19.*

I alledged *Epiphanius*, *who signifies that other Cities had two Bishops together, and excepts only* Alexandria. To which he answers, *that* Epiphanius *cannot mean that all other Cities had two Bishops at a time*, nor did I say that he meant this, but his expression imports no less than that it was *usual for other Cities to have two Bishops.* Nor is there any reason to think that *Epiphanius* respects only the

the caſes alledged; it was quite another caſe that was the occaſion of his words; and diverſe other inſtances might be brought of a different nature and occaſion, though this be ſufficient to ſhew, that the rule againſt two Biſhops in one City was not *inviolable*: He adds, 'I 'do not ſee what advantage can be made of this paſ- 'ſage.

This *paſſage* ſhews that there was commonly two Biſhops in a City at once, *Alexandria* is only excepted as varying herein from other Cities. And this is *advantage* enough *for me*, and it is enough *againſt him* too; and leaves no reaſon for his pretence that it was only in *extraordinary caſes*. I affirmed it *could not be* Epiphanius *his meaning (as a great Antiquary would have it) that* Alexandria *was never ſo divided, as that ſeveral parties in it ſhould have their reſpective Biſhops there*, and brought ſeveral Inſtances to evince it: *for ſo it was divided in the time of* Epiphanius, *when the Catholicks had* Athanaſius, *the* Arians *had* Gregorius, *and then* Georgius; *and afterwards the one had* Peter *the other* Lucius, *and the* Novatians *had their Biſhops ſucceſſively in that City till* Cyril's *time*.

'He anſwers however I do not ſee why that learned 'Antiquarie's opinion may not be maintained againſt this 'Gentleman's objections, he ſayes that *Alexandria* was 'divided before *Epiphanius* his time between ſeveral Bi- 'ſhops (I ſaid in *Epiphanius*'s time) it cannot be denied. 'But that is not the thing *Epiphanius* ſpeaks of, but that 'before the Election of *Theonas* againſt *Athanaſius*, 'there were never two oppoſite Biſhops as in other 'Churches.

But this doth neither *agree* with the one nor *defend* the other; it agrees not with *Epiphanius*, but makes him contradict himſelf, for he tells us there were two oppoſite Biſhops at *Alexandria* before *Theonas* was choſen.

ſen. For this was not till *Alexander*'s death, but he ſayes *Piſtus* was made Biſhop there by the *Arians* while *Alexander* was living *o*. And he could not be ignorant of what *Euſebius* declares *p*, that upon the diviſion in *Egypt* occaſioned by *Arius*, in every City, κατ' ἐκάστην πόλιν, *there was Biſhop againſt Biſhop*, and People againſt People. Nor doth it *defend* the *Antiquary*, for he ſpeaks univerſally without limiting himſelf to the Election of *Theonas*, *Eccleſiam Alexandrinam nunquam in partes ſciſſam quarum ſingulæ Epiſcopum ſuum habebant*, *that Church was never divided ſo as to have oppoſite Biſhops.*

o Her. 65. Num. 8. p. 733.

p Vita Conſt. l. 3. cap. 4.

'The inſtances are all later than this Fact, and there-'fore are inſignificant, ſayes he.

They are fully *ſignificant*, both in reference to the *Antiquary* againſt whom they are brought to prove that he miſtook *Epiphanius*, when he would have it to be his meaning, that *Alexandria* was never ſo divided as to have two oppoſite Biſhops; for they ſhew it was often ſo divided: and alſo in reference to *Epiphanius*, they were ſo late as his time on purpoſe, to ſhew more unqueſtionably, that could not be his meaning, which was againſt his knowledge, and notorious inſtances in his own time.

But he will not deny the *inſtance of the Novatians to be ſignificant*, *only* Socrates *does not ſay that they had their Biſhops ſucceſſively to* Cyril's *time.*

Nor do I ſay he does; but he ſayes Cyrill *ſhut up the* Novatian *Churches there*, *and took away all the ſacred treaſure in them*, *and deprived their Biſhop* Theopompus *of all he had.* Now when our *Author* meets with Churches, and a *Biſhop* over them; he is not wont to queſtion a *Succeſſion*, unleſs it appears he was the firſt.

'It may be they began there after this time, for there 'is little Account in Church-Hiſtory, that I know, of 'any *Novatians* in *Alexandria* before *Athanaſius*,

We

We are little concerned about this, yet it may be they began before this time, *for there is no account at all in Church History, that the* Novatians *began there in, or after* Athanasius *his time.*

I had produced evidence that many *African Bishops* declared, in the case of *Valerius* and *Austin*, that it was *usual* in all parts, to have two Bishops in a City at once; to this he answers, 'but suppose all this true, that this 'might be maintained by the Examples of several 'Churches, what is it that two Bishops may be in one 'Church? no, that is not the matter, but that a Bishop 'when he growes old, may appoint or ordain his Suc-'cessour, to *prevent the mischiefs, that are usually produced* 'by popular Elections.

If what the *African Bishops* did alledge, were restrained to that particular *case* he contends for; yet this is enough to make good all I intend, viz. that *usually* in the antient Church, there *were two Bishops together in one place.* For when one is ordained Bishop in the same place, when another is still living; with whatever design, upon what occasion soever this is done, yet there are two Bishops at once in the same place.

I see no reason why this should be restrained to that *particular case*, the occasion of what the Bishops affirm may clear it, and that was *Austin*'s scruple, not to succeed *Valerius*, but to be made Bishop of *Hippo*, while his Bishop there was living, *Episcopatum suscipere, suo vivente Episcopo, recusabat*, for so there would be two together, which he took to be against the Custom of the Church, *contra morem Ecclesiæ*; but they all perswade him that this was usually done, *id fieri solere*, and prove it by examples in all parts *q*. And *Valerius* his desire and proposal was, that *Austin* might be ordained Bishop of *Hippo*, *Qui suæ Cathedræ non tam succederet sed Consacerdos accederet, not as one that was to succeed him only, but to be Bishop together with him.*

q *Possidon. vitâ August. cap.* 8.

When he assigns this as the reason of appointing a a Successour, to *prevent the mischiefs that are usually produced by popular elections*, he speaks his own sence, not theirs; for they were better advised than to brand the general practice of the ancient Church as *mischievous*, and how this suggestion becomes one, who undertakes to write a *vindication of the Primitive Church*, let himself consider. Others may judge it, a more intollerable reflection upon the universal Church in the best and after times, than any *M. B.* can be justly charged with. However the reason assigned for it by *Possidonius* is another thing than appears in this Authors whole account, it was because *Valerius feared lest some other Church, should seek him for their Bishop, and get a person so approved, from him.* Ibid.

Whereas in fine he sayes, 'These Cases specified 'were not thought to violate the Rule that allowed but 'one Bishop to a City. Yet it was thought so by St. *Austin*, when he excuses his suffering himself to be made Bishop with *Valerius, by this*, that he knew not it was forbidden by a *rule* of the *Nicene Council*, *Quod Concilio Niceno prohibitum fuisse nesciebam*, and gives this as the reason why he would not so ordain *Eradius.*

Next he would prove, that this *provision for a Successour does not destroy that Rule*, by an instance, I need not transcribe it at large, the sum of it is this, *when the Government is Monarchical, if it fall out* once (in many Ages, as it did in *England* once in above 500 years) *that another King be crowned, besides him who hath the Throne; yet it will be true enough, that it is the rule of those Kingdoms to have but one King.* To which I say briefly, if it be *usual* to have two Kings in such a Government, it will scarce be thought true, that it is *the inviolable Rule* of those Kingdoms, to have but one King. And then how this instance will sute his purpose,

poſe let thoſe judge who take notice, that, I have already proved it *uſual* in the antient Church for Cities in all parts to have *two Biſhops at once.*

From *pag.* 12. he paſſes to *pag.* 23. To ſhew there were more Biſhopricks than one in the Region or Dioceſs of *Hippo* I brought ſeveral inſtances; and might have produced more, but that I confined my ſelf to thoſe which the learned *Dean* alledged to the contrary. *Fuſſala* is one of them, and that alone this *Gentleman* takes notice of. St. *Auſtin* calls it *Caſtellum* diverſe times in one Epiſtle. He finds fault that I tranſlate *Caſtellum* a *Caſtle.* I did no more expect to be blamed for this, than if I had render'd *Oppidum* a Town. But I ſuppoſe he counts it no great crime, ſince he runs into it himſelf and in a few lines after calls it a *Caſtle.*

'But theſe Caſtles, ſayes he, were Garriſon Towns, 'with a good dependance of Villages belonging to 'them.

They were Fortreſſes, and ſometimes had Villages depending on them, and might contain ſo many buildings as there are in ſome Village or little Town; however he calls them *Caſtles*, and may give me leave to do ſo too.

He adds, "It was 40 miles diſtant from *Hippo*, and 'was in St. *Auſtine*'s Dioceſs, and never had a Biſhop of its own.

It is ſaid indeed to belong to the *Dioceſs of* Hippo, but I do not find it ſaid to be in St. *Auſtine's Dioceſs* or Biſhoprick; theſe are two things and ſhould not be confounded. When it is ſaid to *belong to the Dioceſs of* Hippo, ſo farr diſtant, Dioceſs is not taken as an *Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe* as it is with us, for part of a Countrey under the Government of *one* Biſhop; but as it was uſed in *Africa* in a *civil* ſenſe, for part of a Province, without reſpect to *one Biſhop*, or to *any one Biſhop* at all. Some

parts there call'd Dioceſſes *had no Biſhops, nor were to have any* by Decrees of the *African Councils* r. Other places called a *Dioceſs* had more Biſhops than *one*. *Petilian* ſayes, that in the place where his Collegue *Januarius* was Biſhop there were 4 Biſhops beſides, all five in *unâ Diœceſi* s. And thus it was in many other places, particularly in that called the *Dioceſs of* Hippo, as I ſhew'd by diverſe inſtances, and St. *Auſtin*'s own Teſtimony.

r *Con. Carth. 2. Can. 5. Code Afric. 53.*

s *Coll. Carth. D. 1 Num. 117.*

Hereby it appears, that in *Africa*, a *Dioceſs* and a *Biſhoprick* were not the ſame thing, though they be with us. There were diverſe Dioceſſes and no Biſhopricks and many Biſhopricks where but one Dioceſs; ſo that *Fuſſala* and 20 other Caſtles and Towns might be in the *Dioceſs of* Hippo, *at* 40 *miles diſtance* or more; and yet St. *Auſtin*'s Biſhoprick, not one jot the larger for it, nor he more a Dioceſan.

Whereas he adds, *that it never had a Biſhop of its own.* It is unqueſtionable that *Fuſſala* had a Biſhop of its own in *Auſtin*'s time; and this renders it wholly unſerviceable to their purpoſe, for the Biſhoprick of *Hippo*, ſaid to be *of* 40 *miles extent*, will not upon the count of *Fuſſala* be 40 yards larger. Nor will either of theſe Biſhops, nor any other in that Region be Dioceſans; unleſs there can be two Dioceſans, and I know not how many more, in *one Dioceſs*.

I aſſigned this reaſon, why *Fuſſala* had not a Biſhop ſooner, becauſe *Auſtin* declares, *there was not one Catholick in it*, and ſuppoſed this might ſerve the turn, not dreaming that thoſe who count all the people in a very large Pariſh, or in an 100 Pariſhes little enough for a Dioceſan; could think his Dioceſs competently furniſhed when he had not *one Soul* (or but ſome few) in communion with him.

He ſayes, *the Town or Caſtle indeed had none, but the County belonging to it had ſome*; he will have the Territory

tory or Parish depending on this *Castle* to be a *County*. I cannot but observe the admirable power of a fancy tinctured and prepossessed. It will turn a *Parish* into a *County*, and a *Castle* into a *County Town*; and since a *County* with us, was a *Province* with them, one *Province* must be as much as all *Africa*; and a very small *part* of *Numidia*, must far greater than the *whole*. But there are some *Hypotheses*, which may stand in need of such imaginations.

However he likes not my reason, and why? because, *though it had no Catholicks in it then, it might have some before* and concludes it had, *because it belonged heretofore to the Diocess of Hippo*.

" But that it formerly had Catholicks, (saies he) we " may conclude by Mr. *Baxter*'s reasoning, because it " belonged heretofore to the Diocess of *Hippo*.

If *Diocess* be taken in a *civil* sense (as it is frequently in *African* Authors) this will be no proof, that *there had been any Catholicks in it*, because in this sense *Fussala* might belong to that Diocess, though there had not been either Christian or Bishop in the whole Region: Nor will it be hereby proved, taking it in the Ecclesiastical sense; for that part of *Hippo*, which was under the *Donatist* Bishop, had no Catholick; and yet *de jure*, as he tells us, belonged to the Diocess, (as he calls it,) or charge of St. *Austin*. Yet since he allows Mr. *Baxter*'s Argument, he must admit what it concludes, *viz.* that a place that hath no Christians or Catholicks in it, belongs to no Bishop; and then *Fussala* never belonged to St. *Austin* as its Bishop; either *before* it had Catholicks, for against this the Argument is admitted to be conclusive: not *after*, for then it had a Bishop of its own. And so all they have to alledge for the largeness of St. *Austin's* Bishoprick comes to nothing.

" So

"So that I conceive the reaſon will not hold, for its "having no Biſhop of its own, ſince the ſame reaſon "deſtroys its dependence upon the the Dioceſs of *Hippo*, "which is expreſly affirmed.

The reaſon I gave for its having no Biſhop, was, becauſe St. *Auſtin* declares *there was no Catholick in it.* This reaſon will *hold*, unleſs they think a place may have a Biſhop where there are no Chriſtians at all; when as yet they judge, that a place which hath Chriſtians enough to make a *good Congregation*, or *many*, ought not to have a Biſhop. Whereas he ſayes this reaſon *deſtroys its dependance upon the Dioceſs*, I wonder what *dependance* he imagines, ſince it is ſuch, as both the *not having* of Chriſtians, and alſo the *having of them*, deſtroys it. The former he here affirms, *the ſame reaſon* (which is its not having of Catholicks) *deſtroys it*; the latter is undeniable, for when *Fuſſala* had a competent number of Catholicks, a Biſhop was there conſtituted; and then it depended no more on the *Dioceſs* of *Hippo*, than one Biſhop's Church depends on another, when both are independent.

The dependance of *Fuſſala* upon *Hippo* was ſuch, as that of a Countrey place upon a greater Town well furniſhed with Officers for their help, to convert and reduce the Inhabitants, and when enough are converted to help them to a Biſhop or Paſtor. This St. *Auſtin* did for *Fuſſala*, he imployed Presbyters to reduce the Donatiſts there, and when they were reduced, he adds them not to his own charge, would not have them *Epiſcopo cedere*; but adviſes them to have a Biſhop of their own, and procures one for them. This was the practice of the primitive times, in theſe methods were Churches and Biſhops multiplyed; it was not out of uſe in the *fifth Age*, this of *Fuſſala* as managed by St. *Auſtin* is a remarkable inſtance thereof; and if other Biſhops had imitated

imitated him, as he did the Apoſtles, and beſt Ages, the Church would not have been troubled with debates about *Dioceſans.*

That *Auſtin* would not take the Charge of a Place ſo far off as *Fuſſala*, he will have it *aſcribed to his Modeſty.* But it was ſuch *Modeſty* as this excellent Perſon made Conſcience of, being convinced *certiſſimâ ratione*, by *moſt certain reaſon*, that he was not ſufficient for it. If all other Biſhops had been ſo *modeſt*, ſo conſcientious, there might have been, as *Nazianzen* ſpeaks, when Biſhops were multiplyed in *Cappadocia*, Ψυχῶν ἐπιμέλειαι πλείων, a much more deſirable thing, to thoſe that *love Souls*, than a great Dioceſs.

He gives a reaſon why this muſt be aſcribed to St. *Auſtin's modeſty*, becauſe *he diſcharged the Office of a Biſhop there, in more difficult times, while the Presbyters he imployed there, were barbarouſly uſed.*

I need not deny that he performed the *Office of a Biſhop* there; for it is the office of a Biſhop to endeavour by himſelf or others, the converting or reducing of all that he can. Only this will not prove *Fuſſala* to be then a part of his Biſhoprick, no more than it will prove *Athanaſius* to have been Biſhop of *India*; becauſe he encouraged, and ſent *Frumentius* with others thither, to convert the *Indians* t.

t *Soc. l.* 1. *c.* 15. *Soz. l.* 2. *c.* 23.

The learned *Dean* had cited *Auſtin* as calling himſelf the Biſhop of that *Dioceſs* (underſtanding by it a Region of vaſt extent) I obſerved that in the Epiſtle quoted he onely ſaith he had the *Epiſcopal charge of* Hippo. By this the Gentleman changing my words, will have me to ſignifie, that he was the Biſhop of the *Town only.* This I did not intend, but that he was not *the only Biſhop* of that whole Region. But whether he was Biſhop of part of the Town only, or of that and ſome part of the Region alſo, I am not much concerned. His words are

as

" as if he had been Bishop of the Town only, nay, but " of part of that neither, for the *Donatists* had their " Bishop there: so this will strangely diminish the Bi- " shoprick of St. *Austin* which at first appeared so large. Then he answers, for *the Donatists having a Bishop there, it signifies little to our present purpose, since he was but an Usurper.*

But this signifies as much to my purpose as I need; for the *Donatists* having a Bishoprick in *Hippo*, St. *Austin's* must needs be diminished thereby, and altogether as much lessened, as if they had not been *Usurpers.* And they were counted no otherwise *Usurpers*, but so that if the *Donatist* Bishop had been reconciled; by a Decree of the *African* Church he was to continue in his Bishop-there, as a *rightful Possessour*, and there would have been still two Dioceses (such as they were) in one Town.

He would have us *believe Austin* as if he declared, that he was not the Bishop of the Town only; but his words are, *Ut modum dispensationis meæ non supergrediar hoc Ecclesiæ ad Hipponensem Regionem pertinenti prodesse contestor*, which, sayes our Author, plainly signifies, *that all the Church belonging, not only to the Town, but but also to the Region of* Hippo, *belonged to him.*

But if he please to view the words again which himself hath quoted, he will find it plainly signifyed, that Austin's *Church belonged to the Region of* Hippo, *but not that all the Church both in Town and Region, belonged to him. Antonius* Bishop of *Fussala* might have said this as truly of his Church there, as *Austin* did it of his Church at *Hippo*; it did *ad Hipponensem Regionem pertinere*, belong to the Region of *Hippo.* And it may be as justly inferred from hence, that all the Church both in the Town and Region of *Hippo* belonged to the Bishop of *Fussala.* If our Author will allow of this (as he must if he will stand

ſtand to his own account of this paſſage) *Auſtin*'s Biſhoprick will be *ſtrangely diminiſhed* indeed, it muſt be confined to a part of *Hippo*, and made leſs than I repreſent it. For I did not ſay, nor had I any need to aſſert, that he was Biſhop of the Town only. We may allow him beſides his part of the Town, diverſe Villages in the Countrey (though I have not ſeen it proved) without any danger of aſſigning him a *Dioceſan* Church. For *Kidderminſter* (as one tells us, who very well knows it) hath 20 Villages belonging to it, and ſome thouſands of Souls therein, yet according to our modern meaſures will ſcarce make a *Dioceſan* Church *u*.

u M. B. *of Epiſcopacy, Part 2. p. 9.*

To ſhew that there were *more Biſhops in the Region of* Hippo, than St. *Auſtin*, beſides particular inſtances (which he paſſes by) I alledged a paſſage of his where the *Donatiſts* were deſired to *meet together with the Catholick Biſhops, that were in that Region, and who there ſuffered ſo much by the Donatiſts :* to this he anſwers, "That theſe Biſhops who are ſaid to be in *Regione Hip-* "*ponenſi*, were not the Biſhops of that *Region*, but "ſome Biſhops of the *Province* met together there.

But that theſe were Biſhops of the *Province* met together there, is a meer conjecture of his own, without the leaſt ground either in this paſſage or any other in that *Epiſtle*. It will not be hard to anſwer any thing at this rate. If there had been a *Provincial* Council then held in that *Region*, there might have been ſome pretence for what he ſayes; but there is not any hint of this in the whole *Epiſtle*. That which is deſired is a *Meeting for conference*, *Hoc eſt ergo deſiderium noſtrum, &c. Primum ſi fieri poteſt ut cum Epiſcopis noſtris pacificè conferatis* ——, *ideo nos conferre volumus* ——, and the prime occaſion of it was the outrages committed in that Region by the *Donatiſts*, wherein the Biſhops of that place were particularly concerned. This is ſigni-

fyed, as in other parts of the Epiſtle, ſo particularly in the *paſſage cited*, *Epiſcopos noſtros qui ſunt in Regione Hipponenſi, ubi tanta mala patimur.* This Meeting was to be with the *Catholick* Biſhops upon the place, in *Regione Hipponenſi*, not any to be call'd from other parts. And theſe words ſeem brought in to prevent an objection which the *Donatiſts* might make againſt a more general, or more publick meeting, as that which might bring them in danger of the Laws in force againſt them; *An fortè iſtæ leges Imperatoris vos non permittunt noſtros Epiſcopos convenire*, and then immediately follows theſe words in anſwer to it, *Ecce interim Epiſcopos noſtros qui ſunt in Regione Hipponenſi*, &c. ſo that this to me ſeems the plain ſence of both Objection and anſwer; If becauſe of the Laws you dare not meet us in a more General or Provincial Council, yet give a Meeting to the Biſhops of this particular Region, where there can be no apprehenſion of danger. All which makes me judge, what he ſayes concerning the *Biſhops of the Province* as here intended, to be no better than an Evaſion.

To prove that there was but one Biſhop in the Region of *Hippo*, he tells us, "That the Clergy there cal-"led in the Inſcription of an Epiſtle, *Clerici Regionis* "*Hipponenſium*, ſpeaking of the Biſhop of *Hippo*, do call "him their Biſhop, and not one of their Biſhops, *&c.*

But the Clergy ſo called, may be only the Clergy of *Hippo*, and ſo they are in the Title of the Epiſtle *Clerici Hippone Catholici*: and well may they of *Hippo* be called the Clergy of the *Region*, both becauſe they were in that Region, and were the Clergy of it κατ' ἐξοχὴν. But if the expreſſion ſhould be extended to *more* or to *all* in the Region, their calling him *Epiſcopus noſter*, will be no proof that they had no other Biſhop, but him at *Hippo*. For that phraſe

phraſe *Epiſcopus noſter* or *Epiſcopi noſtri*, all along in this Epiſtle, doth not denote the Biſhop of that *particular Church* to which they belonged (as he would have it) but a Biſhop of their *party* or *perſwaſion*. So they call *Valentinus noſtrum Catholicum Epiſcopum*, who yet was not Biſhop of *Hippo*. So they call them *Epiſcopos noſtros*, whom they deſired the Donatiſts to meet once and again *w*, and thrice in another page, where our *Author* finds *Epiſcopos noſtros x*. He may have many more inſtances hereof in that Epiſtle. If there was ſo many Biſhops in *Hippo* or in that Region, as the Clergy call *Epiſcopos noſtros*, he muſt grant many more Biſhops in that Region than I need deſire. So that this *Phraſe* however it be underſtood, is a *medium* unhappily choſen: if it be taken in *my ſenſe* it is impertinent and can conclude nothing for him; if it be taken in his *own ſenſe*, it will conclude directly againſt him.

w pag. 373.

x pag. 371.

He paſſes to *Alexandria*, and to *pag.* 32. *The inſtance of* Mareotis *he ſayes little to*, ſo our Author, I might think it enough, where there was ſo little occaſion.

"He inſinuates as if *Mareotis* might not have number "enough of Chriſtians to have a Biſhop, but this *Atha-* "*naſius* does ſufficiently ſhew to be a groundleſs con- "jecture.

I had no intention or occaſion to ſignifie that *Mareotis* had not Chriſtians enough to have a Biſhop, I knew that it both had many Chriſtians, and a Biſhop alſo, and named him too; and therefore the *groundleſs conjecture* may be fixed ſomewhere elſe.

"And even before *Athanaſius*, the generality of the "People there were Chriſtians.

How long before? *Dionyſius* in the latter part of the third Age declares it ἔρημον τῶν ἀδελφῶν, quite *deſtitute of Chriſtians y*, and the gaining the generality there, to the Faith, required ſome conſiderable time, and it is

y Euſeb. l. 7. c. 11.

like proceeded not far, till Christianity generally prevailed.

Besides *Ischyras*, I had mentioned *Dracontius*, both Bishops in the *Territory* of *Alexandria* (as *Agathammon* also was z) of *Dracontius* he takes notice, and sayes, *possibly he was a Chorepiscopus*.

z *Apol. 2. p. 612.*

But a Chorepiscopus is elsewhere with him a *Diocesan a*, and here he sayes that he did *accept a Bishoprick*. Now these put together will go near to make a *Diocesan* Bishop. But then if there were two or three Bishops in the Dioceſs of *Alexandria*, besides *Athanasius*; they will scarce be so much as half *Dioceſans*.

a *pag.* 590.

He sayes *Athanasius press'd him to accept it*. If so this great Person was no more unwilling to have another Bishop in his *Dioceſs*, and in a *Countrey place* too, than *Austin* was to have one at *Fussala*. He sayes further this was an *extraordinary case*, though what was *extraordinary* in it I cannot imagine; to prove any thing there mentioned to be so, will be an hard task.

"And allowing this man a Countrey Bishoprick, "that of *Alexandria* would be a great deal too bigg for "the Congregational measure.

And so it might be, and yet be no *Dioceſan* Church; if that will satisfie him which is *too big for those measures*, he seems content to drop his cause, and may leave it in the hands of *Presbyterians*. And he is in the more danger, because he seems not apprehensive of it, but counts it enough if he thinks a Church is any where found larger than *one* Congregation.

I had given instances of several Towns that had Bishops, and were but two or three or four *&c.* miles distant one from another this he denies not: but asks *what does this conclude? might not those Dioceſſes be yet much larger than one Congregation?*

I might conclude that theſe were juſt ſuch *Dioceſſes* as our Countrey Pariſhes are; and had ſuch Congregations as thoſe Pariſh Churches have. And ſome of them in time might have proviſion (as ſome of ours have) for more Congregations than one. And if our *modern Dioceſſes* were of this proportion, they would be much more conformable to the *antient* Modells.

"Suppoſe the chief Congregations of *Holland* had "each a Biſhop, yet I conceive they would be Dioce-"ſans, though thoſe Cities lie verycloſe together.

He might have laid the *ſcene* at home, where we are better acquainted, and ſuppoſed this of our Countrey Towns; or of both the *chief*, and *leſſer* Towns in *Holland*; if he had deſigned what would be moſt parallel. But to take it as it is formed, though thoſe Cities lay not further diſtant, and had each of them a Biſhop, yet if their Churches were governed in common by Biſhop and Presbyters, as the antient Churches were; they would not be *Dioceſan*, but more like the Model of the Churches and Government which *Holland* hath at preſent.

"And now after all this, though we have ſeveral in-"ſtances out of *Egypt*, how near Cities were together "in ſome parts; yet upon the whole account the Dio-"ceſſes do appear to be large enough, from the num-"ber of them.

He would have us think where Cities are *ſo near together* (as I had ſhewed) yet becauſe of *their number* the Dioceſſes might be large enough. But where they were ſo near together, they could not be large enough to make any thing like the modern Dioceſſes, no, nor larger than our Countrey Pariſhes if they had Biſhops in them. And the Ancients thought themſelves obliged by the *Apoſtle*'s rule to have a Biſhop, not only in ſome but in every City, ἐπισκόπων ἔδει πολλῶν, ſayes *Chryſo-*

ſtome,

b In 1 Tim. Hom. 11.

stome, καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν προηγησαμένων b, and *Theophilact* expresses κατὰ πόλιν by καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν, without exception of the smallness of the place or its nearness to others. The reason diverse Cities had none, was the want, or the inconsiderable number of Christians in them. Nothing but this hindered any City from having a Bishop in the four first Ages; though the greatest part of their Cities (as may be made manifest) were no greater than our Market-Towns or fairer Villages. And upon this account many Cities might want Bishops, and it may be did so, in *Egypt* particularly; *Heathenisme* prevailing in many places there, even in *Athanasius* his time; for which I could produce sufficient evidence; but will not now digress so far. Afterwards the affectation of *greatness* in *some*, was the occasion of new measures; and orders were made that Towns which had no Bishops before should have none after: though the reason why they had none before was gone; and those places had as many or more Christians in them, than most Episcopal Cities had of old.

c Athan. Apol. 2.

" For in *Athanasius* his time there were not an hundred Bishops in all *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis* c.

I was a little surprized to read this, and see *Athanasius* cited for it. For I knew that *Athanasius* reckons 95 Bishops from *Egypt* besides himself, at the Council of *Sardica*; and others from *Africa*, wherein *Lybia* and *Pentapolis* are usually included; and it was never known that a major part or a third of the Bishops in a Countrey, did come to a *Council* at such a distance as *Egypt* was from *Sardica*. It is scarce credible that *Athanasius* would so far contradict himself, as to say there were not so many Bishops in all those *three* Countreys, when he had signifyed there were many more in *one* of them. Some mistake I thought there must be, and consulting the place I found it not intirely represented.

There

There is this Clauſe (immediately following the words he cites) left out, ἐδεὶς τέτων ἡμᾶς ἤπᾶτο, *none of theſe accuſed me*, whereby it appears that the meaning of the whole paſſage is this, *there was an hundred Biſhops in the Dioceſs of* Egypt *who appeared not againſt him*, or that favoured him. But thoſe who favoured *Arius* (whom he calls *Euſebians*) and *Meletius*, to ſay nothing of *Coluthus* (for into ſo many parties was that Countrey then divided) are not taken into the reckoning; otherwiſe it would have amounted to many more than an hundred. *Sozomen* ſayes the Biſhops there, who took *Arius* his part were many, πολλοι τῶν ἐπισκόπων *d*, and in *Athanaſius* there is an account of many *Meletian* Biſhops by name *e*; and in *Epiphanius* it is ſaid, that *in every Region* through which *Meletius* paſſed, and *in every place where he came he made Biſhops f*.

d *Lib.* 1. *c.* 14.

e *Apol.* 2. *p.* 614.

f *Ep. Hær.* 68.

The next thing he takes notice of is the defence of Mr. *Baxter's* Allegation out of *Athanaſius*, to ſhew, that all *the Chriſtians of* Alexandria (M. *B's* words are, the main body of the Chriſtians in *Alexandria*) *could meet in one Church.*

"It is to be confeſſed that the expreſſions of that "Father ſeem to favour him, χωρεῖ πάντας εὐχεσθαι and that "the Church did πάντας δέχεσθαι hold all, *&c.*

I am made more confident by all that is ſaid to the contrary, that the evidence is really ſuch, as will need no favour, if it can meet with Juſtice.

"Now ſuppoſe that all the Chriſtians in *Alexandria*, "the Catholicks at leaſtwiſe, could meet together in "that great Church, yet all the Dioceſs could not.

All that was undertaken to be proved by the paſſage in queſtion, was, that the *main body of Chriſtians in* Alexandria adhereing to *Athanaſius* could, and did meet in that one Church. If this be granted nothing is denied that he intended to prove. As for a *Dioceſs* in the Countrey,

Countrey, if he will ſhew us what, or where it was, and that it *had no other Biſhop in it*, he will do ſomething that may be conſidered; yet nothing at all againſt what this Teſtimony was made uſe of to evince.

He ſayes 2dly, "Suppoſe this great great Church "could receive all the multitude, yet if that multitude "was too great for Perſonal Communion it is inſignifi- "cant.

Upon this *ſuppoſition* it might be too great for an ordinary meeting in the Congregational way, yet not big enough for a Dioceſan Church. But the *ſuppoſition* is groundleſs and contradicts *Athanaſius* who ſayes they had Perſonal Communion, *they all prayed together*, and did not only meet within the Walls, but *concurred in the worſhip, and ſaid, Amen.*

He ſayes 3dly, "Before the Church of *Alexandria* "met in diſtinct Congregations, but we are told that "*thoſe places were very ſmall, ſhort and ſtrait places.*

All theſe *ſave one*, I ſaid, which he ought not to have omitted. And they were ſo *ſmall*, becauſe thoſe who were wont to meet in them ſeverally, ſo as to fill them, could all meet in one Church, and did ſo as *Athanaſius* declares.

"But that they were ſuch Chappels or Churches, as "ſome of our Pariſhes in *England* have as great a num- "ber as *Alexandria*, is hardly credible.

I know not how thoſe places could be well expreſſed with more diminution than *Athanaſius* hath done it, he ſayes they were not only *ſtrait* and *ſmall*, but the very *ſmalleſt*. If he will make it appear that our Churches or Chappels are leſs than thoſe that were ἐσχάτοι, I ſhall underſtand that which I could never before, that ſomething is *leſs* than that which is *leaſt of all*. But he will prove they were not ſo *ſmall*, becauſe firſt *the Church of* Alexandria *was very numerous from the begin-*

ning

ning. Why it ſhould be counted ſo very *numerous from the beginning*, I know no reaſon, but the miſtake of an *Hiſtorian* who will have a *Sect* of the *Jews* (which was numerous in or about *Alexandria*) to be Chriſtians.

" And if they met all in one place it muſt conſequent-
" ly be very large.

The ground of the conſequence is removed, *Valeſius* his own Author ſayes they had *but one Church to meet in, in* Dionyſius *his time*, almoſt 3 Ages from the beginning *g*. If that one was large, yet it is not like that it ſtood till *Athanaſius* his time; after ſo many *Edicts* for demoliſhing of all Chriſtian Churches, and a ſevere Execution of them in *Diocletian*'s Perſecution. g pag. 64.

" Nor is it likely they ſhould divide till they were
" grown too numerous for the biggeſt Meeting-place
" they could conveniently have.

It is as *likely* as that *Athanaſius* ſpeaks truth, in a matter which he perfectly knew; he tells us they did *divide*, and yet were not too numerous for *one great Church*, in which they met conveniently too; yea, better than when diſperſed in thoſe little places, as he ſayes and proves, τοῦτο ϲέλπον ἦν, *&c.*

2dly, He ſayes, " Though before the *Empire* was con-
" verted they might be confined to little places, and
" forced to meet ſeverally; yet after *Conſtantine* became
" Chriſtian, it is not likely that the *Alexandrians* would
" content themſelves with *ſmall* and *ſtrait* Chappels.

Nor did they content themſelves with thoſe little ones, for beſides this built in *Athanaſius* his time, there was one greater than thoſe ſmall ones finiſhed in *Alexander*'s time, where the body of Catholicks aſſembled with *Alexander*, the other places being too ſtrait, στενῶν ὄντων ἄλλων τῶν τόπων, this is *that one* I excepted, when I ſaid (after *Athanaſius*) that *the reſt, all ſave one, were exceeding ſmall.* But is it any proof that theſe were not

very ſmall which *Athanaſius* repreſents as ſuch, becauſe there was one (expreſly excepted from that number) ſomething larger ? As for what he adds, that *then every ordinary City, built very great and magnificent Cathedrals*, it is eaſily ſaid, but will never be proved.

" 3dly, Some of theſe Churches had been built with " a deſign of receiving as many as well could have per- " ſonal Communion in Worſhip together.

Neither will this hold, unleſs ſome of thoſe Churches could have received *all*, which had *Perſonal Communion* with *Athanaſius* in this greateſt Church ; which he denies, and makes uſe of to *Conſtantius* as a plea why he made uſe of the *greateſt*.

" As *Theonas* is ſaid by *Athanaſius* to have built a " Church bigger than any of thoſe they had before.

Where *Theonas* is ſaid by *Athanaſius* to have built a Church, *&c.* I find not, nor does he direct us where it may be found, I ſuppoſe for very good Reaſon. Indeed *Athanaſius* in this *Apology* ſpeaks of a Church called *Theonas* (it's like in memory of a former Biſhop of that place) where he ſayes the multitude of Catholicks met with *Alexander*, συνῆγεν ἐκεῖ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος ; in like Circumſtances, as a greater multitude aſſembled with himſelf in the new Church, which was greater, and pleads *Alexander's* example in defence of what he did. But *Theonas* could not build this Church, for he was dead many years before, being Predeceſſour to *Peter* whom *Achillas* and *Alexander* ſucceeded *h*.

h Euſeb. l. 7. c. ult. Theodoret l. 1. c. 2.

" And yet this and all the reſt were but few and ſtrait " in compariſon of the great multitude of Catholicks " that were in *Alexandria*.

I expected another Concluſion, but if this be all, he might have ſpared the premiſſes ; for one part of it we aſſert, the other we need not deny, only adding with *Athanaſius*, that the *greateſt* Church was capable δέξασθαι πάντας, *of receiving this great multitude*. But

But here he ſticks, and will wriggle a little more, "But "I conceive, ſayes he, after all this, that the expreſſi- "ons of *Athanaſius* do not conclude that all the Chriſti- "ans in *Alexandria* were met in this great Church.

That *all* and *every one* did come, was never imagined. It is but the *main body* of the Catholicks that M. *B.* intends, as our *Author* obſerves a little before.

"For the *tumultuous manner* in which they came to "their Biſhop to demand a general Aſſembly, makes it "probable that not only Women and Children, would "be glad to abſent themſelves, but *many more*, either "apprehenſive of the effect of this *tumultuous proceeding*, "or of the danger of ſuch a crowd.

The Women he will not admit; but was it ever known that ſuch a great and ſolemn Aſſembly for Worſhip conſiſted only of Men? Were not the Women in Communion with *Athanaſius*'s Chriſtians, that they muſt be left out, when he ſayes all the Catholicks met? Can *all* be truly ſaid to aſſemble when the *farr greater part* (*Women*, *Children* and his *many more*) were abſent? Are not the Women in the *Primitive* Church often noted for ſuch Zeal for the Worſhip of Chriſt, as made them contemn far greater dangers, than here they had any cauſe to be apprehenſive of? The ſuppoſed *danger* was either from the *Crowd* or the *Tumult*. For the former, did *the Women* and *many more* never come to Chriſtian Aſſemblies, when there was any danger of being *crowded*? I think there was as great danger from a *crowd* in *Baſiliſcus* his Reign, when the *whole City* of *C. P.* is ſaid *to have met together in a Church with the Emperour*, but yet the *Women* ſtayed not behind but *crowded in with the men*, as *Theodorus Lector* reports it, πᾶσα ὁμοῦ πᾶς πόλεως ἀνδρῶν ἅμα καὶ γυναικῶν, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ βασιλικῆς συναθροισθέντων i. Beſides *Athanaſius* here ſignifies the danger of a *crowd* was in the leſſer Churches, (not in this)

i *Collect. lib.* 1.

where they could not meet but ἐπὶ κινδύνῳ συνοχῆς, and so prefers their assembling together in the great Church as better.

As for the *Tumults* (which might have been concealed in a *Vindication of the primitive Church*) if there was any thing *tumultuous*, it was over when *Athanasius* had complyed with their desires to meet in the great Church. And so no apprehension of danger left to *women*, or any else, upon this account.

"And even those that did assemble there were too "many for one Congregation, and was an assembly "more for Solemnity and Ostentation than for Personal "Communion in Worship, and the proper ends of a "religious Assembly.

Here he runs as cross, to the great *Athanasius* and the account which he gives of this Assembly as if he had *studied it*, debasing that as more for *Ostentation* than for *Personal Communion* in Worship, and the *proper ends* of a *Religious Assembly*, which *Athanasius* highly commends both for the more desirable *communion* which the Christians had there in *Worship*, and for the greater efficacy of it as to *the proper ends of a Religious Assembly*. Let any one view the passages *k* and judge. He sets forth the *harmony*, and *concurrence* of *the multitude* in *worship with one voice*. He preferrs it before *their assemblies*, *when dispersed* in little places, and not only because *the unanimity* of *the multitude was herein more apparent*, but because God would sooner hear them, ὅτῳ γὰρ παχέως ὁ Θεὸς ἐπακούει. *For if*, sayes he, *according to our Saviour's promise*, *where two shall agree concerning any thing it shall be done for them by my Father*, &c. *how prevalent will be the one voice of so numerous a people*, *assembled together and saying* Amen *to God?* and more to that purpose, by which we may perceive, *Athanasius* being Judge, how true is it that this Assembly was more for

k *Apol.* 2. p. 531. 532.

Solemnity

Solemnity and Oſtentation, than for Perſonal Communion in Worſhip and *the proper ends of a Religious Aſſembly.* And thus much to let us ſee through the *Arts* uſed to cloud a clear paſſage alledged out of *Athanaſius*; if M. *B.* had betaken himſelf to ſuch *little deviſes*, in like Circumſtances; our *Author* would have taken the Liberty to tell him, that he was driven to hard Shifts.

Before we leave *Alexandria* I am to take notice of what is ſaid by our *Author*, to part of a Letter writ by a Friend to M. *B.* concerning this *City* and the number of Chriſtians therein in *Conſtantius* his time. The *Writer* of it obſerves a groſs abuſe put upon him in the *Vindicator*'s Anſwer to it, and deſires his defence may be here inſerted. It contains an argument to confirm what was concluded from that paſſage in *Athanaſius* here inſiſted on, that the Catholicks *then could meet in one place.* After that *paſſage* and to this purpoſe M. *B.* introduced it, as is very apparent *l.* This our *Author* ſeems to obſerve *when he begins* with it; *he adds*, ſayes he, *to this of* Athanaſius (the very paſſage mentioned) *another argument given him by a learned Friend m.* And *after* he hath done with it *n*, *becauſe M.* B. *has endeavoured to repreſent the Church of* Alexandria *ſo inconſiderable even in* Conſtantius *his dayes*, &c. And yet, how it comes to paſs I know not, it is quite out of his thoughts while he is examining it. He was ſo haſty for confuting, that he ſtaies not to take notice what he was to confute, though the intent of it be moſt plain and obvious, both by the *occaſion* and *words* of the *Letter*: But Forces that ſenſe on it, and makes that the deſign of it; which I was far from thinking, would ever come into any man's Fancy, when he was awake. The words of the Letter are theſe; *The City of* Alexandria, *ſayes* Strabo, *is like a Soldiers Cloak*, &c. *and by computation about ten miles in compaſs, a 3d. or 4th. part of this was taken up with publick*

l Church Hiſt. pag. 9. 10.

m Pag. 58.

n Pag. 63.

publick buildings, Temples and Royal Palaces; thus is two miles and an half or three and a quarter taken up. He answers," I will not say this *learned friend* hath imposed " on M.*B.* but there is a very great mistake betwixt them.

But the mistake is his own, and such a one, as I wonder how he could fall into it. He takes it for granted, that the Argument is brought to prove what Christians *Alexandria* had in *Strabo*'s time. Here is not the least occasion given for this, unless the citing of *Strabo* shewing the dimensions of that City: but *Primate Usher* is quoted too, on the same account; and so as much reason to fancy the design was to shew what Christians *Alexandria* had in the *Primate's time. Jerome, Epiphanius, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen* are also cited there; why could not these as well lead him to the right Age, which their words plainly point at, without the least glance at any Age before, as *Strabo* alone (cited without any respect to the time when he writ) so far mislead him? Nay, the 4th. age is expresly mentioned in the Letter; and the numerousness of the *Novatians* and *Arians* in *Alexandria* at the time intended, is insisted on; could he think any man so stupid, that had but the least acquaintance with those things, as to speak of *Arians*, and *Novatians* in *Strabo*'s time? But it may be, though I would hope better, our *Examiner* was too inclinable to fix an absurd thing upon the *Writer* of the *Letter*; that he might be excused, from giving a better answer when it was not ready.

But let us hear what he sayes to it; yet what can be expected to be said by one who makes his own dream the Foundation of his Discourse? However let us try if we can find any one clause that is *true and pertinent* in the whole, and begin with the best of it.

Though *Strabo* sayes that Temples and great Palaces took up a 4th. or a 3d. of the City, yet our *Examiner* will

will have us think there might be inhabitants there; when *Epiphanius* ſayes, as I cited him, that part was ἔρημος, deſtitute of Inhabitants, ſo he tells us *Bruchium* was. The Examiner denies not *Bruchium* to be that Region of the City which *Strabo* ſayes, *was taken up with Publick Buildings*, but adds, *what all the publick buildings of the Town in one Region?* But who ſaid *all* the Publick Buildings? This is his own fancy ſtill.

" And that an outer skirt too, as it is deſcribed by " the Greek *Martyrology* in *Hillarion*, &c.

If he mean it was not a Part or Region of the City *Strabo* and *Epiphanius* will have Credit before a *Story* out of the Greek *Martyrology*, or him that tells it, when it appears not in the words cited. In *Strabo* it is μέρος *part of the City*, in *Epiphanius* it is a *Region*, ἐν τῷ βρουχίῳ καλουμένῳ κλίματι. For as *Rome* was divided into 14 *Regions*, and *C. P.* in imitation of it, ſo *Alexandria* was divided into 5, whereof *Bruchium* was one, and the greateſt of all. So I underſtand *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who upon the loſs of *Bruchium* ſaith, *amiſit regionum maximam partem quæ Bruchium apellatur*; *Alexandria loſt the greateſt of its Regions, which was called* Bruchium.

de pond. ut mens p. 166.

" This *Epiphanius* ſayes was deſtitute of Inhabitants in " his time, and not unlikely, and perhaps deſtitute of " Publick Buildings too, for it was *deſtroyed* after an " obſtinate ſiege in the Reign of *Aurelian* as *Ammianus* " *Marcellinus*, or of *Claudius* as *Euſebius*.

When he hath granted all that I deſigned, *that this part was deſtitute of Inhabitants*, and more too, that it was *deſtroyed*, yet he would have the City *no leſs, no neceſſity of this*, ſayes he, ſure we are not yet awake? can a City looſe τέταρτον ἢ καὶ τρίτον τοῦ πάντος περιβόλου μέρος, in the *Hiſtorian's* words, a 4*th. yea, or a third part of its largeneſs*, and yet not be ſo *much the leſs?* He hath nothing to ſalve this, but it *may be*, and it *might be*, ground-

groundleſs ſurmiſes, without either reaſon or authority.

" They might inlarge upon another quarter, being it " may be forbid to build *Bruchium*—— they might " dwell cloſer than before, and ſo their multitude be un- " diminiſht.

How far it is from being true, that *their multitude was undiminiſht*; and *how needleſs either to inlarge— or to dwell cloſer*, may ſoon appear. The multitude muſt needs be much diminiſhed in ſuch a War, and a cloſe ſiege of many years continuance, for ſo it is reported both by *Euſebius* and *Jerome*; and it was much waſted and in a conſumptive condition, before it was thus beſieged and diſmantled by *Claudius* 2. or *Aurelian*.

in Chronic.

It was greatly diminiſhed in numbers by *Caracalla* who Maſſacred a great part of the Inhabitants. *Herodian* ſayes, τοσέτος ἐγένετο φόνος ὡς ῥεῖθροις αἵματος, &c. *the ſlaughter was ſuch that with the ſtreams of bloud, which ran from the place, not only the vaſteſt outlets of* Nilus, *but the Sea, all along the Shore of* Alexandria *was diſcoloured o.* Towards the latter end of the third Age, *Dionyſius* gives an account of the ſtrange diminution of the *Alexandrians p*, ſignifying that in *former daies the elderly men were more numerous, than in his time, both young and old, comprizing all from infancy, to extream old age*, ἀπὸ νηπίων ἀξιαμάχων παίδων, μέχρι τῶν εἰς ἄκρον γεγηρακότων.

o *Hiſt. Lib.* 4.

p *In Euſeb. lib.* 7. *cap.* 22.

" However certain it is, that this City long after the " deſtruction of *Bruchium*, retained its ancient Great- " neſs; and is repreſented by no Author as diminiſht ei- " ther in Number or Wealth.

This is *certain* no otherwiſe than the former, *i.e.* quite the wrong way. For not long after the deſtruction of *Bruchium*, in the *Egyptian* War made by *Diocletian* upon *Achilleus*, which *Euſebius*, *Eutropius* and others mention: It was greatly *diminiſht both in numbers and wealth.* For *Alexandria* after a long ſiege, was taken by force and

and plundred, great Execution done upon the Citizens, and the Walls of the Town demoliſhed.

A great part of the City (ſayes the Letter) *was aſſigned to the* Jews, *ſo* Strabo *indefinitely as* Joſephus *quotes him; others tell us more punctually, that their ſhare was two of the five diviſions; though many of them had their habitations in the other diviſions, yet they had two* 5*th. parts intire to themſelves; and this is I ſuppoſe the* πεντε ἰδιε *which* Joſephus *ſayes the Succeſſors of* Alexander, *ſet apart for them; thus we ſee how* 6 *or* 7 *miles of the* 10 *are diſpoſed of.* To this he ſayes, "The number of thoſe "*Jews* was much leſſened within a little while after "*Strabo* by an inſurrection of the *Alexandrians* againſt "them.

I ſuppoſe he means by that ſlaughter of them which *Joſephus* mentions *q*, where 50000 were deſtroyed; but what were theſe to the vaſt number of *Jews* in *Egypt*, which *Philo r* ſayes amounted to no leſs than a million?

q *De Bello Judaic. l.2. c.21.*

r *Legat. ad Caium.*

"The civil Wars afterwards under *Trajan* and his "Succeſſor had almoſt extirpated them.

It was in *Paleſtine* where theſe Tragedies were acted, and was ſo far from extinguiſhing them in *Egypt* or *Alexandria*, that thereby, in all probability; their numbers were there increaſed; for being diveſted of about 1000 Towns and Garriſons by *Severus* (*Adrian's* General) as *Dion* reports, and forbidden all acceſs to *Jeruſalem* as *Ariſto Pelleus* in *Euſebius ſ*, this made other places more deſireable, thoſe particularly where they might have good entertainment as they were wont to have at *Alexandria*, and what *Dion Chryſoſtome* ſayes, confirms it.

ſ *Lib. 4. cap. 6.*

But all this which he ſayes, if there were *truth* in it, is impertinent; for the *Letter* is not concerned what *Jews* were there near *Strabo* or *Adrian's* time, but in

the fourth Age. Yet *this is all* that he hath to ſay to the reſt of the *Letter*, beſides the publiſhing and repeating of his own miſtake, and upon no other ground making himſelf ſport with the Writer of it.

Thus he begins, *by the ſame rule he might have diſpoſed of all at once, and concluded out of* Strabo's *diviſion of the Town, that there was not one Chriſtian in it*: and repeats it thrice in the ſame Page, *No matter what number of* Jews *or Heathens it had in* Strabo's *dayes*——, *it is kindly done to provide for Chriſtians before they were in being, ſurely* Strabo, *who makes the diſtribution, never intended the Chriſtians one foot of ground in all that diviſion, and this learned Friend might have ſpared his little Town of* 8 *or* 10 *Furlongs, which he ſo liberally beſtows upon the Biſhop of* Alexandria, *before our Saviour was born*——, and he is at it again ſeveral times in the following diſcourſe *t*.

t *Pag.* 69. 94.

How deſirable a thing is it to have M. *B.* and *his Friend* render'd ridiculous? when rather than it ſhall not be done, our *Examiner* will publiſh his own indiſcretion ſo many times over to effect it. But I will forbear any ſharper reflections upon this *Author*, for taking him to be an ingenuous Perſon, I may expect he will be ſevere upon himſelf, when he diſcerns his errour; which I doubt not but he will ſee clearly by once more reading that Letter.

Next he would diſprove M. *B*'s repreſentation of the Church of *Alexandria* in *Conſtantius*'s time, by giving a view of that Churches greatneſs from the firſt Foundation of it *u*; which becauſe it may concern the *Letter* duly underſtood, I ſhall take ſome notice of it very briefly. But there is ſomething interpoſed, between this and the *Letter*, which requires ſome obſervance; there we may have an inſtance of this Gentleman's ſeverity upon M. *B.* and how reaſonable it is; "His remark, ſayes he, "upon two Biſhops living quietly in *Alexandria* is ſo "diſinge-

u *Pag.* 61.

" disingenuous a suggestion, that he hath reason to be " asham'd of it.

But what is there in this so *disingenuous and shameful*? Does not *Epiphanius* say this, and our Examiner acknowledge it *b*? Ay, but M. *B.* means that there were not only two Bishops, but their *distinct Churches* in this City. Well, and does not *Epiphanius* give him sufficiground for it? Does he not tell us that *Meletius* made Bishops, who had their ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας in every place where he came? Does he not signifie that the *Meletians* in *Alexandria* had their *distinct Churches* or Meetings both in the time of *Alexander* and *Athanasius*? sayes he not particularly of *Meletius* that *being* familiar with *Alexander* he stayed long in that City, having ἰδίαν σύναξιν σὺν τοῖς ἰδίοις *a distinct Meeting with those of his own Party*? Were there not innumerable Cities in that Age which had *two* Bishops and their Churches, some *three* or *four* at once (those of the *Arians*, the *Donatists*, the *Novatians*, the *Meletians*, &c. besides those who were styled *Catholicks*) Would this Gentleman take it well if M. *B.* should tell him, that he who denies this is disingenuous if he know it, and hath some reason to be ashamed if he know it not? Ay, but *Epiphanius* was deceived in this account of the *Meletians*, and mis-represents them. Indeed our *Examiner* makes as bold with *Epiphanius* (a Bishop of great Zeal and Holiness, a Metropolitan, a famous Writer) as he does with M. *B.* charging him with *much weakness* (as one easily imposed upon) *many oversights, gross mistakes, diverse absurd things, and such stories*, that he will scarce wish worse to his Adversary, than to believe him *c*. Nor does *Epiphanius* alone fall under his censure in his *Vindication of the Primitive* &c. Church (as he calls it) he goes near to *accuse more* particular Persons (Bishops amongst others) of eminency in the antient Church, than he *defends*; so that one

b *pag.* 197.

c *Pag.* 112. 113.

may ſuſpect his deſign was, not ſo much to defend *eminent Biſhops*, as *great Biſhopricks* ſuch as the antient Church had none, and to run croſs to M. *B.* more than to vindicate any.

" In St. *Mark's* time *Alexandria* had ſeveral Churches, though but one Biſhop, *&c d.*

d *Euſeb. l. 2 c. 16*

What *Euſebius* ſayes of Churches in *Alexandria* at that time, is grounded upon a miſtake, as appears, becauſe immediately after the words cited, he adds, *ſo great was the multitude of Beleivers at* Mark's *firſt attempt there, that* Philo *in his writings thought fit to give an account of them,* ὡς καὶ γραφῆς ἀξιῶσαι τὸν Φιλῶνα. *Euſebius* conceived that the *Eſſenes*, as *Scaliger*, or the *Therapeutæ*, as *Valeſius*, whom *Philo* deſcribes, were the Chriſtians of *Mark's* Converſion; and there being Aſſemblies of that Sect of the *Jews* in *Philo's* time, the Hiſtorian ſpeaks of Chriſtian Churches at *Alexandria* in *Mark's* time; but thoſe who believe that he erred in the former, can have no reaſon to give him credit in the latter. Our *Examiner* does not deny that he was miſtaken, but ſayes, *it is not material whether they were Jews or Chriſtians*; yet thoſe who inquire after Truth ſincerely, will think it *material*; and little value a Teſtimony which hath no better ground than a miſtake.

e *Pag. 62.*

The next is no better *e*, that is an Epiſtle of *Adrian*, which others are puzzled to make ſenſe of, or ſuch ſenſe as can have any appearance of Truth. That very paſſage in it, which is the only ground of our *Author's* Argument, himſelf acknowledges to be falſe; for he would ſhew the Chriſtians in *Alexandria* to be numerous enough for his purpoſe, becauſe it is there ſaid that *ſome* (whom he takes to be Chriſtians) did *force the Patriarch* (whoever he be) *to worſhip Chriſt*, and yet adds, *there is no doubt but Adrian does the Chriſtians wrong in this point, for they never forced any to their*

Religion.

Religion. Will he have us to rely upon reaſonings, which have no better Foundation, than what is *undoubtedly falſe* by his own Confeſſion? He ſayes alſo *it is not material to our purpoſe whether this Patriarch were Biſhop of* Alexandria, *or chief Governour of the Jews.* If ſo, then it is not *material* with this *Gentleman*, either to argue from that which is not true, or elſe from that which is nothing to his purpoſe. For if this Patriarch was the Biſhop of *Alexandria*, that they *forced* him to worſhip Chriſt, is *not true*, he did it of his own accord: and if it be not one, who was no Chriſtian, that they forced; then is not any thing in this paſſage to his purpoſe, and *Adrian*'s Epiſtle might have been waved as a meer impertinency.

That which follows *f*, hath not the ſhew of a reaſon, "the great Catechiſts of *Alexandria*, as *Pantenus*, *Clemens*, *Origen* and *Heracles*, did not a little advance "the growth of Chriſtian Religion in that place, *&c.* f *Pag.* 63.

Muſt there needs be a *Dioceſan Church* there becauſe the *Catechiſts* did advance Religion not a little?

The next concerning *Dionyſius* his Church meeting at *Chebron* (*Cephro* it ſhould be) and *Coluthio*, is already fully anſwered, as it is offered with better improvement than our *Examiner* gives it *g*. It cannot eaſily be apprehended how a larger Church meeting with *Dionyſius*, made up of thoſe baniſhed with him, and others from ſeveral parts of *Egypt*, at *Cephro*, a Village in *Lybia*, a diſtinct Province; ſhould prove that he had a *Dioceſan* Church in *Alexandria*, to any, but thoſe who are very inclinable to believe it without proof. Nor will others underſtand that *Dionyſius* is better proved to be a Dioceſan by the Chriſtians which came from *Alexandria* to *Coluthio* in *Mareotes*; (there being none there beſides) for the Believers in *Alexandria* it ſelf, were no more than one Church could hold, as *Valeſius* collects from g *No Evidence for pag.* 35, 36.

from this very place to our *Examiners* regret, *Ex hoc loco colligitur, ætate quidem Dionysii, unicam adhuc fuisse Alexandriæ Ecclesiam, in quam omnes Urbis illius fideles, Orationis causâ, convenirebant* h.

h Not. in Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 11.

In the next Paragraph our *Examiner* argues for the great numbers of Christians at *Alexandria*, from the multitude of Martyrs at *Thebes*.

" Under the Persecution of *Diocletian* what numbers " of Christians might be at *Alexandria*, may be judged " by the multitude of Martyrs that suffered at *Thebes* i, " &c.

i Pag. 64.

But here he mistakes *Eusebius*, who gives an account not of the Martyrs which were ἐν Θήβαις, in the *City Thebes*, but κατὰ Θηβαΐδα, the *Province Thebais* : which was half of that large Kingdom, according to the antient division of it into the *upper* and *lower Egypt*. The *Superiour Egypt* was *Thebais*, the *inferiour* was called sometimes the *Delta*, sometimes *Egypt* in a restrained sense, and this division in these terms we have in *Eusebius* (to go no further) a little before k, κατὰ Θηβαΐδα καὶ Αἴγυπτον, where he begins his account of the Martyrs in this Countrey. Now if the Christians in that Provice of large extent, and comprising very many Cities may be concluded to be very numerous from the multitudes of Martyrs which suffered there; yet nothing at all can be inferred for any numbers to his purpose in the City *Thebes*, by which he would conclude their numerousness in *Alexandria*. But if M. *B.* had mistaken one City for so large a Countrey with multitudes of Cities in it, and made that mistake the ground of his reasoning; it is like our *Examiner* would have exposed him for it in his *Preface*, as he does for some lesser matters.

k Cap. 6.

In the following Paragraph *l*, there is a groundless supposition, that the division of *Alexandria into Parishes was antienter than Arius*, there being no mention of it by

l Pag. 65.

by any antient Author: as also an accusation of *Petavius* as mistaking *Epiphanius* his words, without any cause that I can discern in those words, though he says, *it is plain* there. That which he says is plain, the learned Dean of *Paul's* could not discern, but understood *Epiphanius* as *Petavius* and others did before him. These I took to be preliminaries and expected his Argument, but found it not, unless it be couched in the first words. *Serm. of Seperation p. 28.*

"The Division of *Alexandria* between several Pres-"byters, as it were into so many Parishes, *&c.*

But this signifies nothing for his purpose, if those in *Alexandria* thus divided could all meet in one place, as *Athanasius* declares they did; and that so plainly that any one will judge so, whose interest is not too hard for his judgment. *Valesius* (who had no byas unless what might lead him the other way) understood it as I do; and expresses it in these words. (deciding the matter so long insisted on, against our Author) *Afterwards in the times of* Athanasius, *when there were more Churches built by diverse Bishops of* Alexandria, *the Citizens assembled in several Churches severally and in parcels, as* Athanasius *says in his Apology to* Constantius; *but on the great Festivals, Easter and Pentecost, (no particular assemblies were held,* sed universi in majorem Ecclesiam conveniebant, ut ibidem testatur Athanasius, *but all of them assembled together in the great Church as* Athanasius *testifies.*

So that there can be no pretence that the Church in *Alexandria* was *Diocesan* at this time, unless those who could meet together in one place might make such a Church. Yet this was then the greatest Church in the *Empire* save that at *Rome*, and what he adds makes that at *Rome* very unlike such *Diocesan* Churches, as are now asserted.

"*Valesius*

"*Valesius* inferrs from the same passage of Pope *Inno-*
"*cent's* Epistle to *Decentius*, which *Petavius* brings to
"prove the contrary, that though there were several
"*Titles* or Churches in *Rome* then, and had been long
"before, yet none of them was as yet appropriated to
"any Presbyter, but they were served in common as
"great Cities in *Holland* and some other reformed
"Countreys, that have several Churches and Mini-
"sters, *&c.*

The Advocates for *these* Churches, who assign the bounds of a *Diocess* with most Moderation, will have it to comprize a City with a *Territory* belonging to it; but there was no Church in the Territory which belonged to the Bishop of *Rome*, he had none but within the City, as *Innocentius* declares in the cited Epistle, whereas now the greatest City with a Territory larger than some antient *Province* is counted little enough for a *Diocess*. Further it is now judged to be no Diocess which compriſes not very many Churches with Presbyters appropriated to them; but he tells us none of the Churches in *Rome* were appropriated to any Presbyter, but they were *served in common*. How? as greater Cities in *Holland* and some other reformed Countreys, and then they were ruled *in common* as these Cities are. The Government of many Churches is not there, nor was of old, ever entrusted in one hand; and thus the Bishop of *Rome* was no more a *Diocesan* than the Presbyters of that City.

m *Pag.* 66. He concludes *m* with two Assertions which will neither of them hold good. The first *that it is evident out of* Athanasius *how the Bishop of that City had from the beginning several fixed Congregations under him.*

This is so far from being *evident* in *Athanasius*, that he hath not one word which so much as intimates that the Bishop of *Alexandria from the beginning* had any such Congregations under him. The

The other is *that those of Mareotes must be supposed to receive the faith almost as early as* Alexandria.

How true this is we may understand by *Dionysius* Bishop of *Alexandria* towards the latter end of the third Age, who declares that then *Mareotes* was ἔρημος ἀδελφῶν καὶ σπουδαίων ἀνθρώπων *n*, it was so far from having any *true* Christians in it, that it had none of our *Author's old Christians*, i. e. *virtuous, good men o.* Nor is it likely that the faith was there generally received till many years after; and therefore not almost so early as *Alexandria*, unless the distance of above 200 years will consist with his *almost*. For *Alexandria* received the Faith by the preaching of *Mark*, who arrived there, sayes *Eusebius*, in the 2d. of *Claudius p*, others in the 3d. of *Caligula q*. But in the time of *Dionysius* it doth not appear that *Mareotes* had so many Christians, as Bishop *Ischyras* his Church *there* consisted of, though those were but seven, οὐ πλέον ἑπτὰ τῶν συναγομένων ἔχων *r*. But enough of *Alexandria*, though our *Author* is far from bringing enough to prove it even in the 4th. age a *Diocesan* Church. He may be excused for doing his utmost to this purpose, considering the consequence of it, for if this Church was not now so numerous as to be *Diocesan*, it will be in vain to expect a discovery of any such Churches in the whole Christian World in those times; for this is acknowledged to be the greatest City and Church in the *Roman Empire* next to *Rome*. So that there cannot be so fair a pretence for any other inferiour to this, such as *Jerusalem*, *Carthage*, *Antioch*, &c. much less for ordinary Cities, which were 10 times less considerable than some of the former, as may be collected from what *Chrysostome* sayes of one of them δέκα πόλεων πένητας δυνατὸν ἦν θρέψας, that it was able to maintain the poor of ten Cities *s*.

So far the Writer of the Letter. Let me now return to our *Author's Preface*; To shew that the Christians

n *Euseb. l. 7. c. 11.*

o *pag. 60.*

p *Chron. Euseb.*

q *Chron. Alex.*

r *Athan. Apol. 2. pag. 615.*

s *In Mat: Hom. ξστ.*

in *Alexandria* adhereing to *Athanasius* were not so exceeding numerous as is pretended, and not to be compared with the Christians now in *London*, I had said, *that the greatest part of the Inhabitants of that City were at this time Heathens or* Jews; *of those who passed for Christians, it is like* Athanasius *had the lesser share* u, *the* Novatians *and other Sects, the* Meletians *especially, and the* Arians, *did probably exceed his flock in numbers, it may be the* Arians *there were more numerous.* This last clause (which appears by the expression, I was not positive in) he alone fixes on, and would disprove it by a passage out of *Athanasius*. But the Greek is false printed, and and the sense defective for want of some word, and so no Judgment can be well passed thereon, unless I saw it; and where to see it he gives no direction. My concern therein is not so great as to search for it through so voluminous an Author. It will serve my turn well enough, if the *Arians* were but very numerous, or as *Sozomen* expresses them, ἐκ ὀλίγου μοῖρα τοῦ λαοῦ ἦν, which cannot be denied, though they *alone* were not more numerous. The last thing he would take notice of, is the Diocess of *Theodoret*, but this is remitted to the *Dean of* Paul's, yet one thing he sayes he cannot omit; though some may think that he had better have passed it (as he had many other things); than being so much in haste, to slip at almost every line, as he does in those few which concern it.

u Pag. 34.

w Lib. 1. c. 14.

If these 800 *Churches, not* 80 *as this Gentleman reckons them* (it was not he but the *Printer* that so reckoned them, as the *Errata* shew) *belonged to him as Metropolitan, and they were all Episcopal Churches* (I never met with any before, that took them for *Episcopal Churches*, and how he should fall into this mistake I cannot imagine; I will not believe that he creates it, to make himself work) *this poor Region of* Cyrus *would have more*

Bishops

Biſhops than all Africa (not ſo neither, for by the *conference at* Carthage, and the *abbreviation* of it by St. *Auſtin*, much more to be relyed on, than the *Notitia* publiſhed by *Simond*, which is neither conſiſtent with others, nor with it ſelf, *Africa* had many more Biſhops than 800) *notwithſtanding they were more numerous there than in any part of the World beſides.* Nor will this paſs for true with thoſe, who take his own account concerning their numbers in *Africa* (which he reckons but 466 taking in thoſe of the *Schiſmaticks* too; about 66 for each Province one with another, counting them as he does *ſeven*:) and the account which others give of their numbers, in the antient *Roman Province*, the *Kingdom of* Naples, the *Iſland Crete*, *Ireland*, to ſay nothing of *Armenia*, and other parts of the World. *Vindic. p. 149.*

That which follows, is I ſuppoſe, inſtead of an *Anſwer* to the *other part* of my *diſcourſe* concerning the *popular election* of Biſhops, which this *Gentleman* was as much concerned to take notice of, as of the few paſſages he hath touched in the *former part*, why he did not I will not enquire further, but ſatisfie my ſelf with what is obvious; eſpecially ſince he tells us he intends a diſcourſe of ſuch a Subject. If in this deſigned work he ſatisfies me, that it was not the *general practice of the antient Church, for the People to concur in the choice of their Biſhops*, he will do me a greater diſpleaſure, than the confutation of what I have writ, or any other that I can fear he intends me; by taking me off from further Converſation with *antient Authors*, as perſons by whoſe Writings we can *clearly* know nothing. For if *that point* be not *clear* in Antiquity. I can never expect to find any thing there that is ſo.

I intended to conclude this diſcourſe here, without giving the Reader further trouble; but conſidering there are miſapprehenſions about the Subject in que-

ſtion, thoſe being taken by diverſe, for *Dioceſan Churches* which indeed are not ſuch, and arguments uſed to prove them ſo which are not competent for that purpoſe, (of which there are many inſtances, as elſewhere ſo particularly in the latter end of this Authors diſcourſe): I thought it requiſite for the rectifying of theſe miſtakes, and to ſhew the inſufficiency or impertinency of ſuch reaſonings, to give an account what *mediums* cannot in reaſon be eſteemed, to afford competent proof of *Dioceſan Churches.*

In general, Thoſe who will ſatisfy us that any Churches, in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, were *Dioceſan*, ſhould prove them to be ſuch *Dioceſans* as ours are, as large or near as large; otherwiſe what they offer, will ſcarce appear to be pertinent. For the riſe of this debate is the queſtion between us, whether the Biſhops of theſe times be ſuch as thoſe in the *primitive* Church. This we deny, becauſe modern Biſhops will have *another ſort of Churches* or Dioceſes, than were known in the beſt Ages. Not that we reject all Dioceſes or Dioceſan Churches, for both παροικία and Διοίκησις are uſed by the Antients for ſuch Churches as we allow. It is thoſe of a later Model, that we approve not, as vaſtly differing from the antient Epiſcopal Churches. The modern *Dioceſes*, and Churches thence denominated are exceeding great and extenſive, conſiſting of many ſcores, or many hundred particular Churches, whereas for the three firſt Ages we cannot find 3 Biſhops that had *two* particular Churches in his Dioceſs, nor in the 4th. one in 50 (if I may not ſay one in a hundred) that had *more.* So that the difference is exceeding great, and more conſiderable in the *conſequence* thereof, which I had rather give an account of in the words of the very learned D. *St.* than mine own. *Dioceſes generally*, ſayes he, *in the primitive, and Eaſtern Churches were very ſmall and*

and little, as far more convenient for this end of them in the Government of the Church under the Bishops charge x, and elsewhere, *Discipline,* sayes he, *was then a great deal more strict, Preaching more diligent, Men more apprehensive of the weight of their Function, than for any to undertake such a care and charge of Souls, that it was impossible for them even to know, observe or watch over, so as to give an account for them y, Men that were imployed in the Church then did not consult for their ease and honour, and thought it not enough for them to sit still, and bid others work z.* St. *Austin* speaking of the 3d. Age, makes account of *many thousand Bishops then in the World a.* Our *Author* seems to treat that excellent Person something coursely on this occasion, and goes near to question his judgment or veracity for it, *b* some may think this not over decently done (to say no more) when it is his business, to vindicate some antient Bishops who need it, to reflect upon one, so untainted, as to need none. However since he sayes that *Father judged of other Ages by his own, when Dioceses were exceedingly multiplyed c,* we may suppose he will grant there were *many thousand Bishops* in the 4th. Age. Yet among so many thousand Bishops I do not expect that any can shew me 20 (if I may not say 10.) who had so many Churches in their *Dioceses,* as some *Pluralists* amongst us may have, who yet never pretend to have a *Diocesan Church.* Those therefore who will make proof of such *Diocesan Churches* as are in question, must shew us some in the *primitive times* something like ours in largeness and extent. Amongst the instances produced for this purpose by former or later Writers, I find none any thing near to ours, save that only of *Theodoret* in the 5th. Age. But this in the former Discourse was shewed to be so insufficient to serve the ends it is alledged for, that I may hope it will be prest no more for this Service.

x Pen. p. 376.

y Pag. 332.

z Pag. 333.

a Contra Cresc. lib. 3.

b Pag. 534.

c Pag. 535.

More

More particularly. 1ſt. It proves not a Church to be *Dioceſan* becauſe it conſiſts of more than can meet together in one place, for there are Pariſhes in this Land that contain many hundreds or thouſands more than can meet in the Pariſh Church, and yet are but counted ſingle Congregations. Though multitudes in ſuch Churches be far from proving them to be *Dioceſan*, yet I think *two* inſtances cannot be given in the third Age of more in one Church than are in ſome ſingle Congregations amongſt us; nor many afterwards, till *Arianiſm* and *Donatiſm* were ſuppreſſed; which the latter was not in *Africa* till after the famous Conference at *Carthage*, Anno 410; nor the former in other parts during the 4th. Age; for though *Theodoſius* made ſome ſharp Declarations againſt them and other Hereticks, yet none but the *Eunomians* were proſecuted, if we believe *Socrates d*; that Emperour gave not the leaſt trouble to the reſt, *forced none to communicate with him*, but allowed them *their Meetings*, and even in *C. P.* when afterwards the *Arians* divided among themſelves, each party had ſeveral Congregations in that City *e*; both that which adhered to *Marinus*, and that alſo which followed *Dorotheus*, theſe keeping the Churches *which they had before* and the other erecting *new Churches.*

d *Lib.* 5. *c.* 20.

e *Lib.* 5. *c.* 23.

I know there are thoſe, who from ſome paſſages in *Tertullian f*, would infer that the Chriſtians in his time were the major part of the Inhabitants in all Cities, and ſo enough not only for vaſt Congregations, but for *Dioceſan Churches.* But *Tertullian* was a great Oratour and frequently uſes hyperbolical expreſſions, which ought not to be ſtreined. Such are thoſe inſiſted on, and by regular conſtruction they import no more than that the Chriſtians were very numerous in many parts of the Empire. Thoſe that will have them ſtreined, and underſtood

f *Apol. c.* 37. & *ad Scapulam.*

derſtood as they ſound, offer great injury to *Tertullian*, making him intend that which hath no warrant in any Records of Antiquity, Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, that I can meet with. Before they impoſe ſuch a ſenſe on him, they ought in reaſon to make it manifeſt, that the Chriſtians were the *major part* of the inhabitants in ſome conſiderable Cities at that time; when I believe they cannot produce *two* inſtances in the *whole* Empire, I never yet could meet with *one*.

Our *Author* from theſe Oratorical expreſſions ſticks not to conclude, that it is evident that the Chriſtians were the *major part every where*, *but in* Rome *more eminently ſo*, and Dr. *Downham* ſignifies that *Tertullian ſpeaks chiefly of the City of* Rome *g*, this Gentleman ſayes, *that by his account it is made very probable, that they were the better half of the* Roman *Empire*, and tells us, *it is certain that the number of Chriſtians at* Rome *was proportionably greater than in any part of the Empire.* Now how far the Chriſtians at *Rome* were from being the *major part* of the Inhabitants, we may judge by the vaſt diſproportion between the poor in the Church at *Rome*, and thoſe in the whole *City*. *Cornelius* near 50 years after *Tertullian* (when it was of more growth by half an Age) reckons the poor of his Church to be 1500; whereas out of *Suetonius* and others, the poorer ſorts of Citizens, *quæ è publico victitabat*, are computed to be 320000 *h*.

g *Defence l. 2. c. 5. p. 98.*

pag. 54.

h *Lipſius de Mag. Rom. l. 3. cap. 2.*

Many take occaſion from the thouſands converted at *Jeruſalem*, Acts 2. and 4. to conclude the vaſt number of Chriſtians and exceeding largeneſs of Churches elſewhere. Our *Author* hath nothing from *Scripture* for Dioceſan Churches but this, which is conſiderable *i*; nor will this appear ſo, if but a ſmall part of thoſe thouſands can be counted inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, and ſo fixed in that Church. And this is as demonſtrable as

i *Pag. 435, &c.*

any

any thing of this nature can be. For this miraculous Converſion was at *Pentecoſt*, one of the three great *Feaſts*, when there was a vaſt concourſe of *Jews and Proſelytes from all parts* to that City. Theſe converted were not only Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem* but Forreigners; and in all reaſon *more* of theſe proportionably, as they exceeded the Inhabitants in number. And then thoſe of the City will ſcarce be a 20th part of the 5 or 8000 *Converts*. For the Forreigners that reſorted to *Jeruſalem* at theſe great Solemnities are reckoned to be three millions, ὐκ ἐλάττους τριακοσίων μυριάδων *k*, whereas the Inhabitants of that City were but about an 120000 περὶ δώδεκα μυριάδες, but of this elſewhere more fully.

k *Joſeph de Bel. Judaic. Lib. 2. cap. 24.*

The Author of the Vindication will not have ſo great a part of thoſe *Converts* to be *Strangers*, and to return home when the Feaſt was over, and aſſigns ſomething like reaſons for it.

" 1ſt, That the Scripture gives no countenance to this " Conjecture, but ſayes all thoſe ſtrange Nations were " Inhabitants of *Jeruſalem*, and the Original word in- " clines moſt on this ſide.

That he ſhould ſay the *Scripture gives no countenance to this*, is ſomething ſtrange. It is plain in Scripture, that God injoyned the Children of *Iſrael* to repair to *Jeruſalem* from all quarters of the Countrey where they dwelt thrice a year, for the obſervance of the three great *Feaſts*. And it is apparent alſo that they were wont to come up to *Jeruſalem* at thoſe Solemnities, both *Jews* and Proſelytes, διὰ τὸ πάσχα συνεληλύθασαι πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν *a*. And it is evident in that Chapter cited, *Acts* 2. The Feaſt of Pentecoſt being come, there was a reſort of Jews and Proſelytes from all thoſe parts of the World to this City. Ay, but the Scripture ſayes, *all thoſe Strange Nations were inhabitants of* Jeruſalem.

a *In Euſeb. l. 2. c. 23.*

He

He can't judge that the Scripture ſayes this, but upon a ſuppoſition that the word κατοικοῦντες, *Acts* 2. 5. can ſignify no other thing than *inhabitants*, but this is a miſtake, for the word denotes ſuch as *abide* in a place, not only as *inhabitants*, but as *ſtrangers* or Sojourners. Thus Dr. *Hammond* will have it tranſlated *abiding*, rather than dwelling *b*, *thoſe that were there as Strangers c*, and here expreſſes thoſe *abiding at* Jeruſalem, to be *Jews which came up to the Feaſt of the Paſſeover, and Proſelytes which had come from ſeveral Nations of all Quarters of the World.* Thus alſo Mr. *Mead d*, for *the word* κατοικοῦντες, ſaith he, *which I tranſlate ſojourning rather than dwelling (for ſo I underſtand it, that they were not proper dwellers, but ſuch as came to worſhip at* Jeruſalem *from thoſe far Countreys, at the Feaſt of the Paſſeover and Pentecoſt, and ſo had been continuing there ſome good time) it is true that in the uſual Greek*, οἰκέω and κατοικέω *ſignify a durable manſion, but with the Helleniſts in whoſe Dialect the Scripture ſpeaketh, they are uſed indifferently for a ſtay of a ſhorter or longer time, that is, for to ſojourn as well as to dwell, as theſe two examples out of the Septuagint will make manifeſt*, Gen. 27. 44. 1 Kings 17. 20. *there* κατοικεῖν *is to ſojourn only. In a word* οἰκέω *and* κατοικέω *anſwer to the Hebrew Verb* יָשַׁב *which ſignifies any ſtay or remaining in a place.* *Grotius* ſaith it anſwers the Hebrew word which is render'd not only by κατοικεῖν but παροικεῖν, *&c.* adding, therefore it is not ſaid only of them *who had fixed their habitation, but of thoſe who were come to the City for the celebrating of the Paſſeover or Pentecoſt, ſtaying there for a while.* The beſt and moſt learned Expoſitors generally take it ſo in this place, as denoting, not *ſettled Inhabitants*, but ſuch as reſided there only for a time. Indeed when this Author would have the Scripture ſay all theſe *ſtrange Nations were inhabitants of* Jeruſalem, he makes it ſpeak things inconſiſtent.

b *In loc.*
c *In Act.* 10. 2.
d *In Exercit. in Act.* 2. 5.

For it is said *ver.* 9. they were κατοικοῦντες, *dwellers at Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia,* &c. by which must be understood, either that they were *inhabitants* or *Sojourners* in those Countreys; that they were now *Sojourners* there, no man will imagine, nor can any man be said to be actually a sojourner in a place where he is not, And if they were *inhabitants* of those Regions they could not be *inhabitants* of *Jerusalem*, unless they could be inhabitants of several distant Countreys at once. To the same purpose Mr. *Mead* e. οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν, *where note by the way, that* οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν *are comprehended in the number of those whom my Text saith were* κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *which confirms my interpretation that* κατοικοῦντες *there signifies sojourning, and not dwelling; for that they could not be said to dwell in both places.*

e *Ibid.*

" 2. *Suppose there were some of them strangers,* &c.

Suppose, sayes this Gentleman, there were some of them Strangers? but does any man that understands how or by whom those Feasts were celebrated, ever suppose that there were not very many thousands of *strangers*, such as were not Inhabitants, present at those Solemnities? *Josephus* (and *Eusebius* after him) sayes, there were *three millions* in the City at the Passover, and declares what course was taken to give *Cestius Gallus* a certain account of their numbers; but then they were all in a manner *strangers*, for he adds, πολὺ δὲ τοῦτο πλῆθος ἔξωθεν συλλέγεται, *this vast multitude consisted of Forreigners f.* Yet our Author goes on and confirms himself in the former mistake by another; the verse he cites to prove them fixed Inhabitants at *Jerusalem* is misunderstood, the words are προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ, which do not signifie any fixed abode in that place, but only their constancy or persevering in the duties mentioned while they were there. This is the use of the Expression in the

f *De bel. Jud. lib. 7. c. 24.*

the New Testament, *Col.* 4. 2. τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, and so *Rom.* 12. 12. *Continuing in Prayer*, which they might do if they never had a fixed habitation, nor continued as inhabitants in any place. And thus the *Evangelist Luke* uses the phrase in this book of the *Acts c.* 1. *ver.* 14. *c.* 2. 46. *c.* 6. 4. But our Author I think will never find it used in this form for any settled or continued abode in a place, and had no reason to fancy it here.

He thinks it not probable *g that the zeal and devotion of those Converts would suffer them to leave the Apostles*, whereas it is certain that the Primitive Zeal and Devotion, though it crucified them to the World, yet heightened and improved a Christian care of their Families and the Souls of their Relatives and others. And their zeal for Christ, and love to Souls would hasten them homeward, that they migh acquaint their Families and others with *Christ* and the Doctrine of Salvation, as those dispersed from *Jerusalem* did, *ch.* 8.

g *Pag.* 437.

The *five thousand* mention'd *chap.* 4. *ver.* 4. he will have to be a new accession to the three thousand before Converted, but should not have been so positive in it without reason. Those who are engaged in the same cause with him (besides many others) are not of his opinion herein, as they would have been if they had seen any ground for it. Dr. *Hammond h* takes the 5000 to be the number of the *Auditory*, not of the Converts, Bishop *Downham* includes the three thousand in those five *i*, and the *Dean of* Paul's makes account but of five thousand in all *k*. To me it is not material whether they were 5000 or 8000 or many more, seeing there was not the *twentieth part* of them other than Forreigners, and such as for any thing I can see or hear designed not to *dwell* at *Jerusalem*, and so intended not to fix themselves in that particular Church. There can be no just reckoning of the numerousness of a Church, from

h *In loc.*

i *Defence l.* 2. *c.* 5. *pag.* 85.

k *Serm. of Separation Pag.* 26.

an occasional recourse of strangers, who inhabit remote parts or foreign Countreys.

If there had been more Christians in the Church of *Jerusalem* than could meet in one place, that would be no Evidence that it was a *Diocesan* Church, whereas the whole is said in the *Acts* to meet in one place *l*. He hath nothing to say against this which is considerable, but that the *all*, *may denote only those that were present m*, and so the sense will be, all that were in one place, were in one place, if this can please himself, I think it will satisfie none else. Let Dr. *Hammond* decide this business, for in such a cause we may admit a Party to be Umpire *n*, *What follows*, saith he, *of the paucity of Believers, and their meeting in one place, is willingly granted by us. What they say of the point of time*, Acts 2. 41. *that believers were so numerous, that they could not conveniently meet in one place, this is contrary to the evidence of the Text, which saith expresly* ver. 44. *that all the believers were* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, *which in the last Paragraph they interpreted meeting in one and the same place: the like might be said of the other places*, Acts 4. 3. *and* 5. 14. *for certainly as yet, though the number of Believers increased, yet they were not distributed into several Congregations.*

Concerning the dispersion, *Acts* 8. 1. *o* he tells us, "Though they are all said to be scattered besides the "Apostles, yet it cannot be understood of all the Be- "lievers.

No, but of the generality of them, all that could commodiously fly as strangers might do. Nor must it be confined to *all the Officers* only, the generality of Expositors are mis-represented if this be made their sense, nor doth it appear that *Eusebius* so understood it, μαθηταὶ is used in *Scripture* and *other Writers*, and *Eusebius* himself, to denote Believers and not Officers only. As for the

l Act. 2. 44. 6. 2. &c.

m Pag. 441.

n Answer to L. Ministers. pag. 78. 79.

o P. 442. 443.

the *time* of the diſperſion (though I need not inſiſt on it) probably it was nearer this *great Pentecoſt* than ſome would have it. On the firſt day of the week in the morning were the three thouſand converted, the next or (as ſome tell us) the ſame day afternoon, at the ninth hour *p*, the number of the Converts was increaſed to five thouſand. While this Sermon was preaching the Apoſtles are apprehended and committed to Cuſtody till the next morning. Another, it is like the day after, they are impriſoned, but enlarged by an Angel in the night, *chap.* 5. In or near that week were the ſeven Deacons choſen, preſently after the Diſciples were thus increaſed and the Apoſtles impriſoned and diſmiſſed. The expreſſion ſignifies it, *chap.* 6. 1. It is not ἐν ἐκείναις, in thoſe daies which may admit a latitude and ſome good diſtance of time, but ἐν ταύταις, in theſe dayes, which denotes the time inſtant, or that which immediately enſues, without the interpoſure of any ſuch diſtance. And ſo the phraſe is uſed by St. "*Luke* both in the Goſpel and in the *Acts*. It is Dr. "*Hammond*'s obſervation upon *Luk.* 1.39. The phraſe "ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις, in theſe dayes, ſaith he, hath for "moſt part a peculiar ſignification, differing from "ἐν ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, in thoſe daies. The latter ſignifies "an indefinite time, ſometimes a good way off, but the "former generally denotes a certain time then preſent, "inſtantly, then at that time; ſo here, that which is "ſaid of *Mary*'s going to *Elizabeth* was ſure immediate-"ly after the departing of the Angel from her, and "therefore it is ſaid ſhe roſe up μετὰ σπουδῆς, very haſtily, "ſo *ver.* 24. μετὰ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας, *i.e.* immediately *Eliza-*"*beth* conceived, ſo *chap.* 6. 12. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, *i. e.* then, at that point of time he went out to the Mountain. See *Chap.* 23. 7. *c.* 24. 18. *Acts* 1. 5. *c.* 11. 27. *and* 21. 15.

p D. L.

Imme-

Immediately after the choice of the Deacons, *Stephen* one of the *Seven* is apprehended ἅμα τῇ χειροτονίᾳ, *as soon as ever he was ordained, as if he had been ordained for this alone*, saith *Eusebius* (l. 2. c. 1.) And at the same time the Persecution began which dispersed that Church. Whereas he saith, 'whatsoever numbers were forced away; it 'is likely they returned, if he understand it of the *strangers* driven from *Jerusalem*, that they returned to fix there, or otherwise than occasionally, it is no more likely nor will be sooner proved than what he asserts a little after (pag. 444.) viz. *that the empty Sepulcher preached with no less efficacy than the Apostles.*

This is enough to satisfy what our Author would draw out of Scripture concerning the Church of *Jerusalem.* After some trifling about Objections which he forms himself, and then makes sport with, he comes to prove that *Jerusalem* was a *Dioceſan* Church in the Apostles time. But first he would have us believe that *James was the proper Bishop of that Church*, and would evince it by two Testimonies, that of *Clemens* and *Hegesippus.* But what sayes his *Clemens?* He saith not only *that* James *was ordained Bishop of* Jerusalem *presently after our Saviours Ascension*, but what I think our Author was loth to mention. If he had given us the intire sentence it might have been better understood. *After the Ascension of our Saviour*, Peter, James *and* John, *the most honoured by our Lord, would not yet contend for the first degree of honour*, μὴ ὀρεγόμενοι δόξης, *but chose* James *the just Bishop of* Jerusalem, *Apostolorum Episcopum. Ruffinus* reads it, This seems to signify that his being made a Bishop there, was some degree of Honour above their being Apostles. A learned *Romanist* tells us *q*, that the books where *Eusebius* had this did so abound with Errours, that they were not thought

q *Valez.*

worth

worth preſerving, and ſo are loſt (as thoſe of *Papias* and *Hegiſippus* are for the ſame reaſon) this may prove *one* inſtance of thoſe many Errours. That which ſeems to be the ſenſe of his words is more fully expreſſed by one who goes under the name of *Clemens* too *r*, *James the Lord's Brother was Prince of Biſhops, and by his Epiſcopal Authority commanded all the Apoſtles*, and ſo the former *Clemens* in *Ruffinus* calls him *the Biſhop of the Apoſtles f.* If he means ſuch a Biſhop as ours (and otherwiſe his meaning will not ſerve our Authors purpoſe) then the *Apoſtles* were but the *Vicars* or *Curates* of *James.* This is bad enough if *James* was an *Apoſtle*, the abſurdeſt Papiſt will ſcarce aſcribe as much to *Peter.* But if he was not an Apoſtle, it is yet more intolerable. If our Author can believe his own Witneſs, ſome may admire, but I think few will follow him.

r *l.2.Recognit.*

f *Hiſt. l.2.c.2.*

Let us hear *Hegeſippus* (not quite ſo antient as this Gentleman makes him, ſince he was alive in the Reign of *Commodus*) he ſayes, *James* ruled that Church μετὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. If we take this as it is render'd in *Jerome after the Apoſtles*, it is not only againſt *Grammar*, but without Truth, and makes *James* to be Biſhop when he was dead, for he was martyred about the 4th. of *Nero*, and all the Apoſtles but the other *James* ſurvived him. But if the meaning be that he ruled that Church *with the Apoſtles*, it ſpeaks him no more the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* than the reſt of the Apoſtles, who were not fixed or *topical* Biſhops, but Oecumenical Officers of an *extraordinary* Office and Power and accordingly is *James* deſcribed. One antient Author ſayes that he no leſs than *Peter* did ἐπιτροπὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀναδέξασθαι. And *Epiphanius* reports *t*, that *Hyginus* after *James*, *Peter* and *Paul was the ninth Biſhop of* Rome ſucceſſively, ſignifying that he was as much Biſhop of

t *Hæres. Cerdon.*

Rome

Rome as *Paul* and *Peter*. I need not quote that other Author who ſayes *he ruled the holy Church of the* Hebrews, *as alſo he did all Churches every where founded* u.

u *Ep. to James.*

"However certain it is that *James* was Biſhop of *Je-*
"*ruſalem*, not only from *Hegiſippus* and *Clemens Alex.*
"but alſo from St. *Paul*, who mentions him as one of
"the *Apoſtles* that he had Converſed with in *Jeruſalem*,
"and it is likely there were no more there at that time
"but he and *Peter*.

This is no way certain from *Clemens* and *Hegeſippus*, and ſo far from being *certain* by St. *Paul*, that his mentioning him as an *Apoſtle* makes it rather *certain* that he was not a Biſhop; for the Offices of an *Apoſtle* and of a *Biſhop* are inconſiſtent, as is acknowledged and proved by an excellent Perſon of your own. *w* "The Offices
"of an Apoſtle and of a Biſhop are not in their nature
"well *conſiſtent*, for the *Apoſtleſhip* is an extraordinary
"Office, charged with the inſtruction and Government
"of the whole World, and calling for an anſwerable
"care (the Apoſtles being Rulers, as St. *Chryſoſtom*
"ſaith, *ordained* by God, *Rulers not taking ſeveral Na-*
"*tions and Cities, but all of them in common intruſted*
"*with the whole world*) but *Epiſcopacy* is an ordinary
"ſtanding charge affixed to one place, and requiring a
"ſpecial attendance there, Biſhops being Paſtors who,
"as *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *do ſit, and are imployed in one*
"*place*. Now he that hath ſuch a general care can
"hardly diſcharge ſuch a particular Office, and he that
"is fixed to ſo particular an attendance, can hardly look
"well after ſo general a charge, *&c.* *Baronius* ſaith of
"St. *Peter*, that *it was his Office not to ſtay in one place,*
"*but as much as it was poſſible for one man to travel over*
"*the whole world, and to bring thoſe who did not yet believe*
"*to the Faith, and throughly to eſtabliſh believers.* If ſo
"how could he be Biſhop of *Rome*, which was an Office

w *Dr. Barrow Suprem. p.* 120, 121.

in-

" inconſiſtent with ſuch vagrancy. It would not have " beſeemed St. *Peter* the prime Apoſtle to aſſume the " charge of a particular Biſhop, it had been a degrada- " tion of himſelf, a diſparagement to the Apoſtolical " Majeſty for him to take upon him the Biſhoprick of " *Rome*, as if the *King* ſhould become Mayor of *London*, " as if the Biſhop of *London* ſhould be Vicar of *Pan-* " *cras*. And little before, St. *Peter*'s being Biſhop of " *Rome (it holds as well of* James's *being Biſhop of* Jeruſa- " lem) would confound the Offices which God made di- " ſtinct, for God did appoint firſt Apoſtles, then Prophets, " then Paſtors and Teachers, wherefore St. *Peter* after he " was an *Apoſtle* could not well become a *Biſhop*, it would " be ſuch an irregularity as if a Biſhop ſhould be made a " Deacon.

" Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory makes *James* the ordinary Bi- " ſhop and *Dioceſan* of the place.

There is nothing in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory for it, but what is derived from *Hegeſippus* and *Clemens*, whom others followed right or wrong.

" It is ſtrange to ſee *Salmaſius* run his head ſo vio- " lently againſt ſuch ſolid Teſtimonies as thoſe of *Hege-* " *ſippus* and *Clemens*.

That great perſon underſtood things better, and diſcerned no danger in *running his head* againſt a ſhadow, and there is nothing more of Solidity in what is alledged from thoſe Authors.

Further he would prove it a *Dioceſan* Church by a paſſage in *Hegeſippus*, who ſayes, " that ſeveral of the " *Jewiſh* Sectaries who beleived neither a Reſurrection " nor Judgment to come, were Converted by *James*, " and that when a great number of the Rulers and " principal men of the City were by this Miniſtry " brought to believe the Goſpel, the *Jews* made an " Uproar, the Scribes and Phariſees ſaying, that it was

"to be feared that all the people would turn Chri-
x *Pag.* 446. stians *x*.

He ſayes many of the *prime Sectaries* were converted by *James*, but this will ſcarce prove ſuch a *Dioceſan* Church as he contends for. That which would ſerve his turn (*that all the people would turn Chriſtians*) was not *effected*, but only *feared* by the *Jews*, who took a courſe to prevent it by killing *James*. But if this were for his purpoſe, *Hegeſippus* is not an Author to be relied on, part of the Sentence cited is falſe, *that the Sects mentioned* (and he had mentioned ſeven) *did not believe the Reſurrection nor Judgment*, whereas the Phariſees
In Euſeb.2.c.23. and others of them beleived both, which *Valeſius* obſerves. One falſe thing in a Teſtimony is enough to render it ſuſpected, but there are near twenty things falſe or fabulous in this account he gives of *James*, many of them marked by *Scaliger* *y*, divers by *Valeſius* *z*, and ſome acknowledged by *Petavius* *a*.

y *Animad. in Euſeb. p.* 178.
z *In Euſeb. l.* 2. *cap.* 23.
a *Not. ad Hæres* 78.

He would not have us ſuſpect that the numbers of the Church at *Jeruſalem* were not ſo great as he pretends, becauſe *Pella*, an obſcure little Town, could receive them all beſides its own Inhabitants, "but we muſt un-
"derſtand that Town to be their *Metropolis*, and the
"Believers all ſcattered through the whole Countrey,
"and this as *Epiphanius* writes.

But where does *Epiphanius* write this? Not in the place cited, he writes the contrary both there and elſe-
b Epiph. Hær. 30. where, that *all the Believers* (in one place *b*) that *all the Diſciples* (in another place) πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ᾤκησαν ἐν
c De Ponder. & Menſ. cap. 15. Πέλλῃ *c*, what he adds is but to deſcribe where the Town was ſituated, all *the Diſciples*, *all the Believers* dwelt beyond *Jordan* in *Pella*. Archbiſhop *Whitgift* brings this as a pregnant proof that the Chriſtians at *Jeruſalem* were but few in compariſon (and no more than could all meet *in one place*, as a little before he af-

firms

firms again and again) his words are how few Chri-
" ſtians was there at *Jeruſalem* not long before it was de-
" ſtroyed, being above Forty years after Chriſt? Does
" not *Euſebius* teſtifie *d* that they all were received into a
" little Town called *Pella*? yet the Apoſtles had ſpent
" much time and labour in Preaching there; but the
" number of thoſe that did not profeſs Chriſt in that
" City was infinite *e*. This might be farther cleared by
what *Epiphanius* ſaith of that Church in its return from
Pella, but I deſign briefneſs.

d *Lib.* 3. *cap.* 5.

e *Defence of Anſwer. Treat.* 3. *c.* 6. *pag.* 175.

Our Author adds one Teſtimony more, to ſhew that under the Government of *Simeon* great numbers were
" added to that Church, many thouſands of the Cir-
" cumciſion receiving the Chriſtian Faith at that time,
" and among the reſt *Juſtus*, *&c. pag.* 448.

But thoſe who view the place in *Euſebius* will ſee, that he does not ſay thoſe many of the Circumciſion were converted by *Simeon*, or were *under his Government*, or belonged to that Church; and ſo it ſignifies nothing for his purpoſe. And ſo in fine, the account wherewith he concludes his Diſcourſe of *Jeruſalem* will not be admitted by any who impartially conſider the Premiſſes.

As for his other Scripture inſtances, there is not ſo much as the ſhadow of a proof ſhewed by him, that there were near ſo many Chriſtians as in *Jeruſalem*, or as are in ſome one of our Pariſhes, yea, or more than could meet in one place, either in *Samaria* (where he ſayes it *appears not what kind of Government was eſtabliſhed*, *pag.* 451.) or in *Lydda*, which was but a Village, though a fair one, and far from having *Saron* for its proper Territory, that being a plain between *Joppa* and *Cæſarea*; or in *Antioch*, *pag.* 452. much leſs in *Corinth* and *Epheſus* which he adviſedly paſſes by, *pag.* 456.

Our Author does in effect acknowledge that in Scripture it appears not that these Churches were *Episcopal*, much less *Diocesan*; "It is to be confessed, saies he, "*pag.* 461. that the Scriptures have not left so full and "perfect an account of the Constitution and Govern-"ment of the *first* Churches, *&c.* Thus we have no "more notice of the Churches of *Samaria* and of *Judæa* "(*Jerusalem* excepted) than that such were founded by "the Apostles; but of their *Government* and *Constitution* "we have not the least Information. What *information* then can we have that they were *Diocesan* or *Episcopal?* He goes on, "And the prospect left of *Antioch* in Scrip-"ture is very confused, as of a Church in *fieri*, where a "great number of eminent persons laboured together "to the building of it up; but only from *Ecclesiastical* "Writers, who report that this Church, when it was "settled and digested, was committed to the Govern-"ment of *Euodias*, and after him to *Ignatius*, *&c.* So that after what form the Church at *Antioch* was constituted does not appear (it may be Congregational and not Diocesan, for any thing this Gentleman can see in Scripture) but only from Ecclesiastical Writers.

But his *Ecclesiastical Writers* do so contradict one another as renders their testimonies of little value. Nor is there much more reckoning to be made of the *traditional* account they and others give concerning the Succession and Government of the first Bishops, than this Author makes of *Eusebius* his *traditional* Chronology, *pag.* 454. Some make *Euodias* the first Bishop and he being dead *Ignatius* to succeed him *f*; on the contrary some will have *Ignatius* to have been the first, and make no mention of *Euodias g*; others will have them to have governed that Church both together *h*; some will have *Euodias* ordained by *Peter*, and *Ignatius* by *Paul*, others report *Ignatius* ordained by *Peter*, and some modern

f *Euseb. l. 3. c. 22.*

g *Chrys. Orat. in Ignat.*

h *Clemens Constitut. l. 7. c. 46.*

dern Authors of great eminency, both Proteſtants and Papiſts (not only *Baronius* but Dr. *Hammond*) find no more tolerable way to reconcile them, than by aſſerting that there were more Biſhops than one there at once, which quite blaſts the conceit of a *Dioceſan* Church there.

And what is alledged for the numbers of Chriſtians there, to ſupport this conceit of a *Dioceſan* Church, is very feeble, *pag.* 452, 453. *A great number believed*, *Acts* 11. 21. and *much people*, *ver.* 24. The next verſes ſhew, that there were no more than *Paul* and *Barnabas* aſſembled within one Church; meeting ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, for a year together, and there taught this ἱκανὸν οἱ πολύν ὄχλον. The ſame divine Author ſayes, *Acts* 6. 7. πολύς ὄχλος, *a great Company of the Prieſts were converted*, and will this Gentleman hence conclude that there were Prieſts enough converted to make a *Dioceſe*?

He hath no ground from Scripture to think otherwiſe of *Rome* (that we may take in all his Scripture inſtances together) however he would perſwade us that there were ſeveral Congregations there in the Apoſtles times. Let us ſee how. "By the multitude of "Salutations in the end of that Epiſtle he makes appear "the numbers of Chriſtians in that City. Salute *Priſ-* "*cilla* and *Aquila* with the Church that is in their "houſe.

The *Dean of Pauls* will have this Church in their houſe to be but a *Family*, this Author will have it to be a *Congregation*, as if it might be either to ſerve a turn. I think it was ſuch a Congregation as removed with *Aquila* from one Countrey to another, for this Church which was in their houſe at *Epheſus* before, (1 *Cor* 16.) is ſaid to be in their houſe at *Rome*, *Rom.* 16. that is, there were ſome of the Church which belonged to their Family.

Family. It is a queſtion whether there was now at *Rome* any one Congregation ſuch as our Author intends, *Grotius* [i] thinks it probable *there was none at all.* But let us ſuppoſe this to be a Congregation, where finds he his ſeveral others? why where another perſon would ſcarce dream of any? "It is not improbable, ſaith he, "that ſeveral that are mentioned with all *the Saints that* "*are with* them, may be the Officers of ſeveral Congre- "gations, *pag.* 457. 458.

[i] *In Rom.* 16.

But it is manifeſt that in the Apoſtle's times one Congregation had many Officers, how then can ſeveral Officers be a good Medium to prove ſeveral Congregations? The antient Authors which count thoſe Officers (mentioned *Rom.* 16.) do make them *Biſhops* (and ſome except not *Narciſſus* nor *Priſca*, i. e. *Priſcilla*, tho' her Husband alſo hath an Epiſcopal Chair aſſigned him) Now if they were not Biſhops at *Rome* but other places, they are alledged to no purpoſe; if they were Biſhops at *Rome*, there will be very *many* Biſhops in that *one* Church (it may be more than *Priſcilla*'s Congregation conſiſted of) which rather than our Author will grant, I ſuppoſe he will quit his plurality of Congregations here. Indeed what he adds next doth no waies favour them, and this number was afterwards in- "creaſed conſiderably by the coming of *Paul*, who con- "verted ſome of the *Jews*, and afterwards received all "that came, whether Jew's or Gentiles, and preached "to them the Kingdom of God for the ſpace of two "whole years, no man forbidding him, *pag.* 458.

Paul preached at *Rome* in *his hired houſe for two years*, all this while he received *all that came* to him; there is no queſtion but that all the Chriſtians there did come to hear this moſt eminent Apoſtle: ſo that it ſeems from firſt to laſt there were no more Chriſtians at *Rome* than a private Houſe could receive.

He

He would prove what he intends from *Nero*'s Per-
" ſecution, who is ſaid to have put an infinite multitude
" of Chriſtians to death upon pretence that they had
" fired *Rome*, pag. 458. *Tacitus* ſpeaks of the Chriſti-
" ans as guilty, and ſayes they confeſſed the Crime, and
" detected many others.

Now thoſe who ſuffered, either confeſſed that they fired *Rome* and then they were no Chriſtians; or they did not confeſs it, and then he wrongs them intolerably, and deſerves no credit. But our Author to excuſe him (againſt the ſenſe of ſuch who beſt underſtand him, *Lipſius* particularlay, beſides *Baronius* and others) ſayes, *they confeſſed not that they* burn't *Rome, but that they were Chriſtians.* Whereas the inquiry being concerning the burning of *Rome*, the queſtion was not whether they were *Chriſtians*, but whether they *fired* the City, of this laſt *Tacitus* ſpeaks, and will be ſo underſtood by thoſe who think he ſpeaks pertinently. But for truth in thoſe accounts he gives of Chriſtians, it is no more to be expected than from other Heathen Authors of thoſe Ages, with whom it is cuſtomary on that ſubject *ſplendidè mentiri.* Some other inſtances hereof we have in this report of *Tacitus*, which I ſuppoſe our Author will ſcarce offer to excuſe, as when the Chriſtian Religion is called *Exitiabilis ſuperſtitio*, and when the Chriſtians are ſaid *per flagitia inviſos vulgò fuiſſe.*

But ſuppoſe he ſpeaks truth, what is it he ſayes? Nero *put an infinite multitude of them to death*, but *ingens multitudo*, which are his words, may be far leſs than an *infinite multitude.* Two or three hundred may paſs for a great multitude, and extraordinarily great, when that which is ſpoke of them is extraordinary. The Martyrs burnt in Queen *Mary's* dayes were a *great multitude*; and few may be accounted very many, to

ſuffer

ſuffer in ſuch a manner, as theſe did by *Nero's* Cruelty, *Ferarum tergis contecti ut laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi defeciſſet dies in uſum nocturni luminis uterentur*, in the words of *Tacitus*.

To this he adds the general account which *Euſebius* gives of the ſucceſs of the Chriſtian faith immediately after the firſt diſcovery of it, *that preſently in all Cities and Villages Churches abounding with innumerable multitudes were aſſembled*, &c. *pag.* 459.

If he will not deal unkindly with *Euſebius* he muſt not ſet his expreſſions upon the Rack, nor ſtretch them beyond his intention, nor forget what is obſerved to be uſual with him; *Oratorem more rem amplificare*. Theſe Churches conſiſting of *innumerable multitudes* are ſaid to be not only in *all* Cities, but *Villages*; now I believe it will be an hard matter for our Author to ſhew us any *Villages*, even in *Conſtantine's* time, where there were a Thouſand, yea, or 500 Chriſtians. Thoſe who will not abuſe themſelves or their Readers muſt give great allowance to ſuch expreſſions, and not rely on them in ſtrict arguing.

And here it may not be amiſs to take notice of what he ſayes of *Rome* in another *Chapter*, M. *B.* had declared, *that he found no reaſon to believe that* Rome *and* Alexandria had for 200 years more Chriſtians than ſome *London* Pariſhes (which have 60000 Souls) nor near, if half ſo many *k*. The chief, if not the only argument to prove them at *Rome* more numerous, is a paſſage in *Cornelius* his Epiſtle ſhewing the number of the Officers and of the poor, this was in the middle of the third Age, and ſo not within theſe 200 years, but yet proves not what it is alledged for in *Cornelius's* time, near *Anno* 360. The number of Officers ſignifies no ſuch thing, as hath been made evident, the number of the

k *Church Hiſt. p.* 7. *Vindicat. p.* 27.

the poor, being 1500 rather proves the contrary. This was cleared by comparing the proportions of the poor with the reſt in other places, at *Antioch* in particular, as was ſhewed out of *Chryſoſtome*, who reckons the poor to be a tenth part of the Inhabitants, and if it was ſo at *Rome* in *Cornelius*'s time, the Chriſtians were about 15000. This will ſerve M. *B*'s purpoſe well enough. But the time and circumſtances being exceeding different, makes it moſt probable that the Chriſtians then at *Rome* did nothing near ſo much exceed the poor in number. It is far more likely that the proportions were nearer that at *Conſtantinople*, where *Chryſoſtom* ſayes, the poor was *one half*, this would ſpoil all our Authors pretenſions, and ſo he adviſedly takes no notice of it.

However ſomething he would ſay againſt M. *B*. if one, could underſtand it. It is about the word Πτωχόμυροι in *Cornelius*'s Epiſtle render'd the *poor*. *Valeſius* obſerves the word is uſed by the *Roman Clergy* in an Epiſtle to thoſe at *Carthage*, *ſive Viduæ ſive Thlibomeni*, i. e. *indigentes*, ſaith he, as *Ruſinus* tranſlates it, and tells us alſo that *Cyprian l* calls them *pauperes & indigentes qui laborant*. Theſe, ſayes our Author, were not only *poor*, *but ſick and diſeaſed*, alledging that of the *Roman Clergy* for it after *Valeſius*, and if he mean not only the poor, but the ſick alſo and the diſeaſed he is right, for *Cornelius* ſignifies thoſe that were maintained by the Church, Widows and Indigent whether ſick or well. But when he ſayes *theſe poor were ſuch only as were not able to come abroad*, he ſeems to confine it to the ſick and diſeaſed, and then it contradicts the former, and is without reaſon, againſt the uſe and import of the word, as render'd by all Interpreters former and later that I meet with, and indeed againſt common ſenſe; for the number *Cornelius* ſpeaks of is fixed, as that of the *Presbyters and Deacons*, l Ep. 4.

ſuch as may be conſtantly known and a certain account given of it, whereas the number of the *ſick* is not fixed, but ſuch a contingency as is very uncertain and various.

But *Cornelius* ſayes in the ſame Epiſtle *that the people of his Church were innumerable.* True, that is, according to the frequent uſe of the word, very many (it is granted they were more than in any other Church) as when *Dio* ſayes the Nations conquered by *Trajan* were innumerable, and *Socrates* expreſſes thoſe wounded in the fight between the Chriſtians and Heathen in *Alexandria* about the demoliſhing of an Idol Temple were ἀναρίθμητοι *m*, which in *Sozomen* is but *many n*; and another *antient Author* ſayes there were *innumerable Biſhops in Africa*, which yet this Gentleman can eaſily *count*, and tells us that Schiſmaticks and all were but 466 *o*. M. *B.* may allow him what he falls ſhort in this reckoning, which is more than half, and may grant there were many more hundreds of Chriſtians in *Rome* than any of theſe *innumerables* come to, and yet make good what he ſuppoſes.

m *Lib.* 5. *c.* 15.
n *Lib.* 7. *c.* 15.
o *Pag.* 131.

The great liberality of the *Roman* Church is offered as no ſmall argument of its greatneſs, *they ſent to a great many Churches, releiving thoſe that were in want, and ſending neceſſaries to ſuch as were condemned to the Mines*; thus in *Severus*'s time, and in the time of *Dionyſius the Provinces of* Syria *with* Arabia *were thereby relieved every one, pag.* 53.

M. *B.* need not doubt, but ſome one Pariſh near him might do what is equivalent to this, if the antient Charity were revived, which opened the hearts of Chriſtians in thoſe times further than their Purſes could well extend.

But the words are odly ſtretched, for they did not relieve every one in all thoſe places, but ſuch as were *in great want*, and thoſe particularly who were *condemned*

to

to the Mines; and ἐπαρκεῖν must denote as *it were the al-*
ſufficiency of the Roman Church, which ſome would ſay
is, *as it were Blaſphemy*, but our Author meant better,
the proper import of the word is no more than *ſtipem*
conferre.

He alledges two paſſages in *Euſebius p*, the *former* p *Pag.* 54.
concerns not *Rome* more than any other place in the
Empire, the import of it is this, not that every ſoul of
every ſort, but that many of all ſorts were lead to the
Chriſtian Religion, if πᾶσαν ψυχὴν be ſtretched to every
ſoul *Euſebius* is made to ſpeak what is in a manner no-
toriouſly falſe, and monſtrouſly extravagant. The *later*
which concerns *Rome* does but ſignify, *that more of*
Good quality for Riches and Birth with their Families and
Relatives came over for Salvation q. Theſe he will have q *Lib.* 5. *c.* 21.
to be of the *Nobility*, but thoſe were counted noble who
deſcended from ſuch as had been Magiſtrates in Cities
or free Towns. How this can make that Church near
ſo great as our Author would have it, or greater than
M. *B.* ſuppoſes, I don't underſtand.

What he ſubjoyns is very ſurprizing and muſt ſeem *Pag.* 54.
ſtrange to thoſe who are acquainted with the ſtate of
Church in thoſe times, *that the Chriſtians were the better*
half of the Roman Empire, that they were the major part
every where, but in Rome *more eminently.* This hath no
good warrant from antient Authors, no, not from *Ter-*
tullian, though he writ many years after *Commodus.*
He like an Oratour *draws ſomething bigger than the life*
(as our Author ſayes of *Nazianzen*, pag. 137.) and
muſt have allowance on this account by thoſe who will
not be injurious to him. In that very Age wherein
Commodus reigned, it is ſaid *the Chriſtians were ſo often*
ſlaughtered that few could be found in Rome *who profeſſed*
the name of Chriſt r. And near 150 years after, when r *Platinâ vitâ*
Conſtantine had reigned near 20 years in *Rome* the *gene-* *Xyſti.*

rality of the Inhabitants shewed such disaffection to Christianity, as that is given for one reason why he transferred the seat of the Empire to *Byzantium* *f*.

f Zosimus, Hist. l. 2. p. 61.

He runs beyond M. *B's* bounds towards the middle of the third Century, and tells us *the greatest part of* Alexander Severus *his Family were Christians*. And so they might be, and yet no more Christians in *Rome* for that, if they were Christians before they came into his family, which is more likely than that they were converted in it. However many more such Additions will not increase that Church beyond M. *B's* Measures, nor make it near so numerous as that Parish to which *Whitehall* belongs.

Pag. 55. What he next offers neither concerns *Rome*, being general expressions, nor M. *B.* referring to the Ages after those which he is concerned for, whether by μυριάδες ἐπουράνιαι we understand the great multitudes which were gathered into the Christian Profession (as *Valesius*) or that assembled together for Christian worship (as our Author) is not material; though the former is more likely, unless we can think *Eusebius*, an elegant Writer, would use so much *tautology* in so few lines. That from which he may expect more service is the next expression, which he renders *the multitude of their Meetings in every City*, but may with better reason be render'd, the *numerousness or multitudes of those that assembled in several Cities*. For it is so far from being true, that every City had *many Congregations* of Christians in it; that there were many Cities long after, which had no Christians in them. And two instances cannot be given of any Cities in the whole Empire that at this time had more Congregations than one; unless where they all might have assembled in one place, they thought it better in Prudence to disperse themselves into several Meetings. For in *Alexandria*, which was the greatest City next to *Rome*,

Rome, and the most populous Church in the whole World, there is no appearance of more assemblies till the end of the tenth Persecution, and the death of *Peter* Bishop there, who suffered in the ninth year of it *t*. And therefore the *elegant gradation*, in discovering of which this Gentleman would have us take notice that he has a more comprehensive faculty than *Valesius*, seems not very well founded.

t *Euseb. l. 7. c. 32.*

That which follows is an hundred years or more beyond the time to which M. *B.* limits his Assertion, "About this time or not long after *Rome* had above "40 Churches, which we must not imagine to be built "all at the same time, but by degrees, according as the "number of Believers did require; *&c. pag.* 55.

Pag. 55.

From the number of Churches he can't reasonably conclude such a multitude of Christians as he contends for. There were many Churches in *Alexandria* when *Athanasius* was Bishop of it, and yet there were no more Christians in his communion than could meet together in one place. *Baronius* tells us, that there was a City in *Germany which had* 400 *Churches in it*; and yet no reason to think that Town was comparable for Circuit and Populousness, either to *Rome* or *Alexandria*. If I should say that in *Optatus* there were not so many Churches, but the number mistaken by the Transcribers, this would be as good an answer as that of our Author, who will have the 12 or 14 years of *Athanasius* his Banishment in *Epiphanius* not to be so many moneths, and that years are put instead of moneths by the mistake of the Copies, *pag.* 113. Or that other about the number of Bishops in the Council at *Antioch*, where he will have 30 in diverse Authors to be a mistake of the Transcribers for, 90 (or 97 or 99. *u*) *Onuphrius* must have liked such an Answer to this of *Optatus*, who tho' he was as much concerned for the greatness of the *Roman* Church

Anno 1098, 1.

u *pag.* 123, 124, 125. *Interpret voc. Eccles.*

Church as any, and no leſs inquiſitive into the antient ſtate of it, yet delivers it as a thing manifeſt and certain, that *Rome* had but 28 *Titles*, and this number not compleated till the *fifth Age*. But there's no need to inſiſt on any thing of this nature, it is not ſo material how many Churches there was, as when there was ſo many, and about the time he will have *Blondel* to miſtake, and M. *B.* to follow him therein; he had been nibbling at *Blondell* a little before upon a ſmall occaſion and with as little reaſon, as might be ſhew'd, if it were fit to follow one in his Vagaries. Let us ſee whether here he doth not follow *Valeſius* in his miſtake, who will have *Optatus* to ſpeak of the Churches at *Rome* in the *time of* Diocletian's *Perſecution*, *tempore perſecutionis Diocletiani* w. But *Optatus* ſpeaks of thoſe Churches when extant and capable of receiving Congregation, as is plain by his words; but what Churches were at *Rome* or other places, in the very beginning of that Perſecution, were all quite demoliſhed, and that *in one day*, ſayes *Theodoret* x, or the *Paſchal dayes*, as *Euſebius* y; and there's no probability they could rebuild them while the Perſecution laſted, or that ſo many could be raiſed in leſs than many years after. *Nicephorus* ſpeaks but of 14 Churches at *Conſtantinople* in the reign of *Theodoſius* junior, nor meet I with any Author that gives an account of more, yet this was about an hundred years after *Byzantium* was re-edifyed, and both *Conſtantine* and the ſucceeding Emperours endeavoured to make that City as populous as could be, and furniſhed it with Churches anſwerable to the numbers of the Inhabitants. So that there's no likelihood there could be 40 Churches in *Rome* at any time nearer *Dioclefian's* than *Optatus's*.

w *In Euſeb. lib. 6. c. 43.*

x *Hiſt. l. 5. c. 38.*
y *Chron.*

v. 7. c. 49.

But to help this our Author tells us out of *Optatus*, that

that there were three *Donatiſts* Biſhops at *Rome* ſucceſſively before *Macrobius*, who was Contemporary with *Optatus*, and that the firſt of them was *Victor Garbienſis*, and he will have *Optatus* to ſpeak of the State of *Rome* (the 40 Churches there) not as it was in his own time, but in that of this *Victor*, when this was, he ſayes, is not eaſie to fix. *pag.* 56.

Yet this is certain, it cannot be in the time of *Diocleſian's Perſecution*, for the Schiſme of the *Donatiſts* did not break out till *Majorinus* was ordained (who was the firſt Biſhop of the Faction made in *Africa* or elſewhere) and this was ſometime after the Perſecution was there ended, as *Optatus* and *Valeſius* after him, and others declare z; and ſometime muſt be allowed after this for the *Donatiſts* ſettling in *Rome*, and ſuch an increaſe of them there as to need a Biſhop. *Baronius* makes this *Victor* to be Biſhop in *Silveſter's* time, which might be long enough after *Diocleſian's* Perſecution, for he lived till 335. All which our Author hath to alledge for the more early date of *Victor's* Biſhoprick, is that there were two or three Donatiſt Biſhops between *Victor* and *Optatus*; but this will ſcarce ſerve his turn. For there were four Biſhops of *Rome* in the former part of that very age wherein we are now concerned, who held not the Chair ten years among them, *Marcellus*, *Euſebius*, *Melchiades* and *Marcus*. But we may allow the three Donatiſt Biſhop at *Rome* near ten years a piece from the time of *Optatus*, 378 (as both *Blondel* and *Valeſius* agree) and yet *Victor Garbienſis* may not be Biſhop till *Anno* 350 and ſo nearer to *Optatus* his time, than *Diocleſians*.

z *De Schiſ. Donat. cap.* 3.

2dly, It is no proof of *Dioceſan* Churches that thoſe who belong to it, do occaſionally divide themſelves into diſtinct Meetings, A large Church, and ſometimes

times a small Congregation may have occasion to divide and meet in parcels for their convenience or security. Particularly in time of Persecution, that they may assemble with more safety, and be the better concealed from those who would disturb or apprehend them. The people that belonged to *Cyprian* did meet all together on several occasions, as is apparent in his *Epistles*; yet when Persecution was hot, he thought it advisable, *cautè non glomeratim nec per multitudinem simul junctam, conveniendum l*, they durst not in some parts εἰς τὸ φανερὸν ἐκκλησιάζειν, in the beginning of *Constantine*'s Reign *m*.

l Ep. 5.
m Soz. l. 1. c. 2.

Damasus, the supposed Author of the *Pope's lives*, sayes, *Euaristus Titulos Presbyteris divisit, divided the Titles in* Rome *to the Presbyters*, and by *Titles* some will have us to understand *Parish* Churches. But it is incredible that the Christians in *Trajan*'s time when *Euaristus* was Bishop, could erect any structures in form of Churches, or had any distinguishable from other houses, so as the Heathen might take notice of them, as used or designed for the religious exercises of Christians. Who can imagine that when it was death for any one to be known to be a Christian, they should frequent any *known* places for Christian Worship? It is far more reasonable which *Platina* sayes of *Calistus*'s time, more than an hundred years after, that then the *meeting of Christians were all secret, and rather in Chappels, and those hidden, and for the most part underground; than in open and publick places Cum eâ tempestate ob crebras persecutiones occulta essent omnia, & sacella potius, atque eadem abdita & plerumque subterranea; quam apertis in locis ac publicis fierent.* Dr. *St.* sayes, *I confess it seems not probable to me that those Tituli were so soon divided as the time of* Euaristus, *who lived in the time of* Trajan, *when the Persecution was hot against the Christians*; but *Damasus*

Iren. pag. 357.

seems

seems not to believe himself, for in the life of Dionysius *he saith, Hic Presbyteris Ecclesias divisit.* His reason concludes as much or more against the *Titles* under this notion ascribed to *Marcellus* 200 years after (which some will have to be 25, but *Onuphrius* shews they could not be more than 15 *n*) for *Marcellus* was Bishop of *Rome* for six years of the tenth Persecution begun by *Diocletian*, which was the longest and fiercest that ever befel the Church; when the Christians were so far from erecting any Churches, that all before erected were by severe Edicts to be quite demolished. But what is said of Titles divided by *Euaristus* may be true in this sense, that since they could not safely meet together in the Persecution under *Trajan*, they dispersed themselves into distinct meetings, and had Presbyters assigned to officiate in each of them. And yet the Christians at *Rome* were then no more, nor long after, than might all meet together for Worship, and did so when it could be done in safety. In the time of *Xystus* who had the Chair at *Rome* under *Adrian*, it is said *because of the frequent slaughters of the Christians, there were few found who durst profess the name of Christ, propter frequentes cædes pauci reperirentur qui nomen Christi profiteri auderent o.* And there was an order in that Church that *when the Bishop celebrated, all the Presbyters should be present.* Zepherinus *voluit Presbyteros omnes adesse celebrante Episcopo, quod etiam* Euaristo *placuit*, this is said to be made in the time of *Euaristus* to whom this division of Titles is ascribed, and it was in force an hundred years after, being renewed by *Zepherinus* who was Bishop till *Anno* 218 about 30 years before *Cornelius*, who speaks of 46. Presbyters at *Rome*. Now the Lords Supper was frequently administred in those times, at least every *Lords-day*, and when the Bishop was present, he himself did celebrate, and if all the Presbyters

n *Interpret. Voc. Eccles.*

o *Platina.*

were to *be present when he did celebrate*, then all the People likewise were to be present, or else they had no Publick Worship, for they could have none without Bishop or Presbyters.

3dly, A Church is not proved to be *Diocesan* by the numbers of *Presbyters* in it, this I have made evident before, and made it good against our *Authors* exceptions. But he brings a new instance *p*, and will have *Edessa* to have been a *Diocesan* Church because of the numerous Clergy, the *Clergy*, says he, *of the City of* Edessa *was above* 200 *persons*, *not reckoning that of the Countrey within his Diocese*, *and this was a Diocesan Bishop to purpose*.

p *Pag.* 552.

He did well not to reckon that of the Countrey in his *Diocese* : unless he had kown that something of the Countrey was within his Diocese. It was not unusual for the Bishops charge to be confined to a Town or City *Rome* it self is an instance of it *q*, *Cum omnes Ecclesiæ nostræ intra Civitatem constitutæ sunt*. But why it should be judged to be a *Diocesan* Church because 200 such Persons belonged to it, seeing the great Church at *C. P.* had above 500 Officers assigned it after *Justinian* had retrenched the numbers *r*, and yet was never counted a Diocese, I do not well understand. But he hath some other reasons for it, and because he thinks they prove the Bishop of *Edessa* to have been *a Diocesan to purpose*, let us on the by a little examine them ; these he gives in summarily, *This was a Diocesan Bishop to purpose*, *who besides a large Diocese*, *had excommunicating Archdeacons*, *and a great revenue*.

q *Innocent. Ep. ad Decentium.*

r *Novel.* 3. *c.* 3.

I find nothing alledged to shew he had a large *Diocese* or any at all, but this, *the City of* Battina was in the *Diocese of* Edessa, for *Ibas* is *accused of having endeavoured to make one* John Bishop *of it*, &c.

Battina

Battina had a Bishop of its own, how then can it be said to be in the *Diocese* of *Edessa*, unless Province and Diocese be confounded? *Edessa* was the *Metropolis* of *Mesopotamia*, the Bishop of it was the third *Metropolitan* in the *Patriarchate* of *Antioch*, as they are ordered in the antient *Notitia*. The Bishop of *Battina* was one of the many *Suffragans* belonging to that *Metropolitan*. How then comes the Diocese of *Edessa* to be any wayes large upon this account? Is the *Diocese* of *Canterbury* one foot the larger, because there is a Bishop of *Peterborough* in that *Province*? These things are not easily apprehended nor can be well digested.

2dly, The *greatness of his Revenue* is no more apparent, there is nothing to prove it but the *rickes of that Church*, and its great Revenues, and hereof our *Author* gives us no clear account, no value of the *Numismata*, nor is there any Evidence in the *Council* for the *Mannors* he speaks of but only the *felling of some wood* in a certain place there named. But where there was a *Diocesan* and *Archdeacons*, *decorum* required there should be *Mannors* and vast Revenues for the Bishop. Nor do I quarrel with it, only this breaks the squares a little, and disturbs the correspondence between those and our times; that if the Revenues of that Church had amounted to ten times more, yet the Bishop would scarce have been one jot the *richer* for it. This will not seem strange to any, who take notice of the antient Orders, concerning the revenues of an Episcopal Church. The Bishop was to have *nothing* thereof if he could maintain himself otherwise. When he was necessitous, nothing was allowed him for himself but *necessaries*, *food and raiment* [f]. He was to *purchase* nothing while he lived, nor to leave any thing got by his Bishoprick when he died, to his Relatives or others, but only to the Church that maintained him [t]. The Bishop of

[f] *Con. Antioch. c. 25.*

[t] *Code Justin. Lex 42. Sect. 2. c. de Episc. Nov. 131. c. 13. Con. Car. 3. Can. 48.*

Edeſſa, or any other in theſe Circumſtances, muſt be a poor *Dioceſan*, and one in a good *Engliſh Rectory* or *Vicaridge*, is in a fairer way to be rich, than any in the antient Biſhopricks, ſo ordered. And if Riches or Revenues be good Arguments to prove a *Dioceſan*, one of our Vicars may be a better *Dioceſan* than the Biſhop of *Edeſſa*. It is true there is ſome intimation from *Rome*, that the Biſhop ſhould have *the 4th. part* of the Churches revenues, but there's no appearance of ſuch a *diſtribution*, till after the time of the four firſt general Councils; nor in any Countrey but *Italy* till an hundred years after: Nor did it ever obtain (that I can diſcover after ſome inquiry) in the *Greek* Churches.

3. The other proof that *Ibas* was a *Dioceſan*, viz. *becauſe he had excommunicating Archdeacons*, our *Author* would make good by telling us, *that one of his Archdeacons excommunicated* Maras. Now this though it prove not what it is alledged for, may prove more than he likes. An *Archdeacon* in the antient Church (though he be another thing now) was not ſo much as a *Presbyter*, he was but in the lower Order of *Deacons*, though chief amongſt them, and choſen by them; as *Jerome* ſignifies *u*, *Diaconi eligunt de ſe quem induſtrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocant*, the *Deacons chuſe from amongſt themſelves one whom they know to be induſtrious, and call him Archdeacon.* Now if a Deacon had the *power* to *excommunicate*, there can be no doubt but the *Presbyters* had it, being of a Superiour Order and Power. And excommunication being counted the higheſt act of Juriſdiction, it cannot be queſtioned but the other acts thereof belonged to them; and ſo the *Presbyters* having all the Juriſdiction of *Biſhops* (all the power of Government) what did they want of being Biſhops but the honour of preſiding in their Aſſemblies?

u Ep. ad Evagrium.

And if they were no farther from being Biſhops, they will go near to be as much *Dioceſan*, and ſo this *Gentleman* may chuſe, whether he will have *all* of both ſorts to be *Dioceſans*, or *none* of either.

4ly, It is no Argument to prove a Dioceſan Church to ſhew that it conſiſts of ſuch who live at a good diſtance one from another. *Dionyſius* had a great Congregation at *Cephro*, a Village in *Lybia*, but thoſe which made up this Church were of another Countrey, coming partly from *Alexandria*, partly from other parts of *Egypt*, as *Euſebius* ſhews us, yet none ever eſteemed that to be a *Dioceſan Church*. In *Juſtin Martyr's* time thoſe that were in the Countrey, and thoſe that were in the City, when thoſe were no more than made one Congregation, met together in one place, πάντων κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἀγρὸς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνελθόντας, the Meeting conſiſted of ſuch as lived at a good diſtance, but none will imagine it to be a *Dioceſan* Church, but thoſe who will have a ſingle Congregation to be ſuch a Church. *All the Chriſtians in City and Countrey*, ſays Dr. *Downham*, *if they had been aſſembled together, would have made but a ſmall Congregation.* w.

w *Defence l.2. c.4.p.69.*

Our *Authour* would prove the largeneſs of *Baſil's* Dioceſs by the diſtance between *Cæſarea and Saſima.* *. He makes much of it and takes the pains to meaſure the diſtance between theſe Towns, or rather, as he ſays, to *make ſome gueſs at it out* of an *Itenerary* and *Putinger's Tables*; yet tells us the diſtance muſt be as great at leaſt as between *Hippo* and *Fuſſala*, that ſo *St. Baſil's* Dioceſs may be as great at leaſt as that of *St Auſtin's*. I think they will prove much alike, for as I have ſhew'd that *Auſtin's* Dioceſs was not one foot larger for *Fuſſala*, ſo it will appear that *St. Baſil's* had not the leaſt enlargement upon the account of *Saſima*. That he might not be out in his meaſures nor have loſt all his labour, two

x *pag.546,547*

things

things ſhould firſt have been cleared, neither of which is (or I think can be proved; 1ſt, That *Saſima* was in *Baſil*'s Dioceſe, for if it was but only in his *Province*, how far ſoever it was from *Cæſarea*, his Dioceſe can be nothing the larger for it, though his Province might. To prove it in his Dioceſe I find nothing but his own aſſertion, that *Saſima is ſaid expreſly to be taken out of the Dioceſe of* Baſil; but where is this ſaid expreſly, or by whom, except by himſelf? The words in the Margin ſignify no ſuch thing, but only ſome attempt to *deprive a Metropolis of* Saſima. For a Metropolis may be deprived of a Town which is in any part of the Province, when another *Metropolitan* ſeizeth on it. And I believe our *Author* is yet more *out* in taking the *Metropolis* which *Nazianzen* ſpeaks of to be *Cæſarea*, when it appears by the *Epiſtle* to be rather *Tyana*. For as the whole Epiſtle is writ to *Baſil*, ſo theſe words cited, after many others by way of ſharp expoſtulation, are directed *to him* as endeavouring to deprive a *Metropolis* of this Town, called ironically τῶν λαμπρῶν Σασίμων: Now *Cæſarea* was not the Metropolis which *Baſil* would have deprived of *Saſima*, he earneſtly endeavoured to have it annext thereto; but he would have deprived *Tyana* of it, if *Anthimus* the Metropolitan there, had not made a ſtout oppoſition. 2dly, He ſhould have proved, that after this part of *Cappadocia* was divided into *two* Provinces, *Saſima* was in that Province which fell to *Baſil*'s ſhare (for if it was not in his Province how could his Dioceſe be any larger for it?) but inſtead of this our Author offers what may ſerve to diſprove it, telling us that in the antient *Greek Notitia*, *Saſima* is ſet down in the *ſecond Cappadocia* (which belonged to *Anthimus* as the firſt did to *Baſil*) *and ſo*, ſayes he, *it is not likely to be very near* Cæſarea. No indeed, it is thereby proved to be ſo far from *Cæſarea*, that it did

not

not enlarge *Basil*'s Province, much less his Dioceſe. Thus it is also placed in the Διατύπωσις of *Leo Sophus* under the Metropolitan of *Tyana*, not of *Cæsarea*. It is true *Basil* laid claim to it, but after some contest he yeilded, and *Anthimus* carried it, placing *Eulalius* there as one of his Suffragans, when *Nazianzen* had quitted it.

He goes farther on to shew the largeness of Dioceses in *Basil*'s Province.

"It is plain by *Nazianzen* that *Cappadocia* had but "50 Bishops, for so many he says *Basil* had under him, "and considering the extent of that Countrey the Dio- "ceses must needs be large.

He does not say *Basil* had no more under him, nor that he was making no more; he knew *Basil* was constituting more Bishops in that part of *Cappadocia* which was his Province, and *Nazianzen* commends him for it as an excellent undertaking on several accounts *y*.

y *Orat. de Bas.*

"Considering the extent of that Countrey, the Dio- "ceses must needs be large, for the Countrey as *Strabo* "computes, is near 400 miles in length, and little less in "breadth.

If he means *Basil*'s own Province, where he told us there were 50 Suffragans under him besides *Sasima*, &c *z*: (as I know not what he can mean else, if his Discourse be not impertinent and inconsistent; for *Basil* as Metropolitan had no Bishops under him, but those in his proper Province) *Strabo* is strangely misrepresented to serve a turn; for it is the *whole Countrey* which passed under the name of *Cappadocia*, that the *Geographer* gives us the dimensions of in the place cited, and tell us it was divided *into ten Prefectures*, *Meletena*, *Cataonia*, *Cilica*, *Tyanitis*, *Isauritis*, &c. whereof *Basil*'s Province was but one, *viz.* that called *Cilica*, and that of *Anthimus*, *Tyanitis*, another, *&c. Mazaca*

z *Pag.* 546.

(afterwards

(afterwards called *Cæsarea*) being Metropolis of *Basil's* and *Tyana* of *Tyanitis*, &c. and after he hath given some account of these *ten Præfectures*, he adds the dimensions of the whole Countrey, in these words, *the extent of* Cappadocia *in breadth from the* Euxine *to* Taurus, *is* 1800 *Furlongs*, *in length* 3000. So that our *Author* will have the extent of *Basil's* Province to be no less than that of the *whole Countrey*, when it is but the *tenth part* thereof. And as if this were not enough, he makes the breadth of the whole Countrey, to be near twice as much as it is in *Strabo*; but he hath some salvo for this, such as it is.

"And little less in breadth, as *Causabon* restores the "reading of 1800 Furlongs in the 12th. *Book*, by "a passage in the *second* where the breadth is made "2800.

It is true *Causabon* observes some difference in the places cited, but he shews how they may be easily reconciled, without changing the Text here, or making the Countrey broader than it is here described, *viz.* by taking *Pontus* in one place for the *Sea*, in the other for the *Region* so called, separated from *Cappadocia by mountains parallel to* Taurus; and then concludes, *Sic non erit discedendum à vulgatâ lectione.* So that he hath no relief by *Causabon* without curtailing the Passage.

"And in this compass Bishops may contrive 50 Dio- "ceses of very competent extent, and not inferiour to "many of ours.

Let him try how in *Basil's* Province of about 40 miles in length, he can *contrive* room for above 50 Bishops, with as large Dioceses as those he pleads for. That which is now thought little enough for *one* Bishop *Basil* conceived too big for *Fifty*.

What

What Dioceſes *Baſil* (and others before him) thought ſufficient for Biſhops both then, and in former times, appears by a paſſage which our *Author* next cites, where *Amphilochius Biſhop of Iconium, is directed to conſtitute Biſhops for the Province of Iconium, in little Corporations and Villages.* *a* Hundreds of inſtances might be brought of Biſhops elſewhere, in *ſuch little places and Villages*, but I will go no further now, than the inſtance himſelf offers us, whereby it is manifeſt that a *little Corporation, or a Village* might furniſh a Biſhop with ſuch a Dioceſe, as was then thought competent, both by *Baſil*, and the Church *before him.* For in ſuch *little places* there was Biſhops before, as *Baſil* there ſignifies, and he gives direction that it ſhould be ſo ſtill. Yet he, that would adviſe the reducing of Biſhops to ſuch *Sees* now, would be counted an enemy to Epiſcopacy; and his advice deſtructive to Biſhops. So much do we now differ, both from the judgment and practice of the antient Church, and the moſt eminent Biſhops in it.

a *Ep.* 406.

Hereby alſo it appears that the *multiplying of Metropolitans* was no ſuch occaſion of *multiplying Biſhops*, but that their numbers *increaſed*, when there was not that occaſion; And this in *Cappadocia*, which is our *Author's* eminent inſtance. *b* For Biſhops were multiplyed by erecting Epiſcopal Sees in *Villages, and little places*, this was done in *Iſauria*, a Province in *Cappadocia*, as appears by theſe paſſages in *Baſil*, before the conteſt between him and *Anthimus*, upon the conſtituting of a new Metropolitan: and after that difference was Compoſed, *Baſil* thought it adviſeable that it ſhould be done ſtill. And the like may be ſaid of *Africa*, the inſtance he moſt inſiſts on, and ſpends many Pages upon it, pretending the occaſion why *Biſhops* were ſo numerous there, was the *Schiſm* of the *Donatiſts*,

b *Pag.* 545.

Whereas the rule by which the *African Fathers* proceeded in erecting Bishopricks in *little places*, and so increasing the number of Bishops, was as themselves declare, who best knew it, *the increase of the number of Christians* : c Where these were multiplyed, and desired a Bishop, they thought themselves obliged to let them have one ; not excepting the meanness or smalness of the places, where he was to be constituted. And we must believe (if we have any reverence for those Fathers) that they would have done, what they judged themselves obliged to, though there had been no *Donatists* amongst them. And when there can be no such pretence of occasion from the *Donatists*, the practice was continued, as appears by *St. Austin*'s procuring a Bishop for *Fussala*, which he calls a *Castle*, upon some increase of the *Catholicks* there, diverse years after the noted *conference* at *Carthage*, where the heart of the *Donatists* was broken ; Nay, many years after the invasion of the *Vandals*, and the death of *St. Austin* they proceeded in the same methods, or rather exceeded their Predecessors in multiplying Bishops, by erecting Episcopal seats in smaller, and more inconsiderable places, if *Leo* his Epistle may be credited. *d*

c Concil. Carth. 2 Can. 5.

d Ep. 85.

But to return to our *Author*, and the passage of *Basil*, insisted on, by which sayes he, 'it appears that 'Isauria was part of *Basil's* Province ; How this appears by any thing therein, I cannot imagine, our *Author* signifies before that *Isauria* was a distinct *Province*, the Metropolis of it (as he supposes) *Seleucia*, which had a metropolitan and suffragans before, and being now destitute, the Bishops in the Vicinity were careful to provide others. Which being so, that it should be part of *Basil's* Province seems as incongruous, as if it were said, that the Province of *York*, is part of the Province of *Canterbury* : but if this could be digested, that

that one Province is part of another, yet *Isauria* would rather be part of *Amphilochius* his province, who (as he tells us) was to *constitute* a Metropolitan and other Bishops therein, than of *Basil's*, who is only represented as giving *advice* about it. Or if giving *advice* and direction, would prove any thing of this nature, the *Papists* might think it a good argument, that *Africa* was part of the *Roman Province*, because *Leo* Bishop of *Rome* gives advise, how Bishops should be there constituted. *e*

e *Ibid.*

Next he brings in the *Chore-piscopi* in order to his design, and tells us *f* they were 'Countrey *Bishops*, and 'their Church consisted of *many* Congregations, and 'those at a good distance one from another, and also 'that some of them had the inspection of a large Ter-'ritory, no less it is like than the County of *Fussala*.

f *Pag.* 550.

But not a word for proof of this, save *Basil's* mentioning a Chor-episcopus τῶν τόπων *of some places*; Whereas if he had been the Bishop of two or three Villages, this might be enough to satisfie the import of that expression. Yet he knows there is some one Countrey Parish, that hath ten times as many, or more Villages in it, but never pretended to be a *Diocesan Church*, and that such a pretence would be now counted ridiculous.

He adds, that which, if it were true, wouldgo near to *dethrone* these *Countrey Bishops*; (for *Basil* speaks of them, as having their *Thrones* in Villages) and render them less than antient Presbyters, for all their *large Territory*, and there being *Dioceſans*.

'But yet these were but the *Deputies* or *Surrogates* of 'the City Bishops in point of jurisdiction, for they 'were to do nothing of moment without their Bishop.

If this be so, it would be less wonder that the *Pope* will have Bishops to be but his substitutes; and that some Bishops will have the Pastors of Parochial Churches to be but their *Vicars* or *Curates*. I hope our *Author* intends better, however it is well that such odd *Hypotheses* have no better support than that which is added, for sayes he, *they were to do nothing of moment without their Bishop*; this is his argument, and he is not alone in urging it. Let us see whether it will not do the Bishops (for whose advancement it is designed) as much disservice, as it can do the Chorepiscopi, or Presbyters; divesting them of that which is counted more necessary and advantagious to them, than a large Dioceſe. The Provincial Bishops were obliged to do nothing, μηδὲν πράττειν ἀνευ δίχα τῦ μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, *without the Bishop of the Metropolis*, this the synod at *Antioch* decrees, *according to an antient Canon of the Fathers*. g By this argument we must conclude, that the Bishops in a Province were but the *Deputies* and *Surrogates* of the Metropolitan. And it may proceed proportionably against the *Metropolitans* with respect to the Ἐξάρχοις or *Primates*; and also to *their* prejudice in reference to the *Patriarchs*. It will go near to destroy the *Bishops* likewise, if we follow it downwards. In the antient Church *the Bishops were to do nothing of moment, without the Presbyters*, this the most judicious and Learned *Asserters* of Episcopacy acknowledge; h Nay further, in the best Ages of the Church, the *Bishops were to do nothing without the people*, that is, without their *presence and consent*. This is most evident in *Cyprian's Epistles*, and is acknowledged by such *Prelatists* as are otherwise reserved enough. i Now by this Argument we may conclude that Bishops were but the *Deputies* or *Surrogates* of the Presbyters; or which will be counted more intolerable, that Bishops had

g *Can.* 9. *Can. Apost.* 35. *Concil. Milev. Can.* 13.

h *B. Bilson, Dr. Field, Dr. Downham, B. Hall, M. Thorndike, B. Usher.*

i *Vide defence of Dr. St. Pag.* 407.

had their jurisdiction from the people by *Deputation and Vicarage*. It may be this *Gentleman* will not like his argument so well, when he sees what improvement it is capable of, yet in pursuance of it he adds, 'Basil 'is so resolute upon his prerogative, that he will not en- 'dure they should ordain, as much as the inferiour 'Clergy, without his consent; and if they do, let 'them know, (sayes he) that whosoever is admitted 'without our consent shall be reputed but a Layman.

I suppose the *Prerogative* for which he will have *Basil so resolute*, is a *Negative* in ordinations upon the Countrey Bishops; but this cannot be concluded from the words cited. For the Council of *Nice* gives the Metropolitan a power, as to ordinations in the same words, [k] declaring that if a Bishop be ordained by the Provincials, χωρὶς γνώμης, *without the judgment of the Metropolitan*, the great Council will have *him accounted no Bishop*; and yet the Metropolitan had no *Negative* upon the Provincials in Ordinations, for the same *Council* determines, that in ordinations *plurality of Votes shall prevail*, which is utterly inconsistent with any ones *Negative voice*. What then is the import of *Basil's* ἀνὰ γνώμης? take it in the words of a very Learned and Judicious *Dr.* of this Church, *it is indeed there said, that none should be ordained* χωρὶς γνώμης *without the opinion of the Metropolitan, but that doth not import a Negative voice in him, but that the transaction should not pass in his absence, or without this knowledge, advice and suffrage*, &c. [l]

[k] Can. 6.

[l] Barrow of the Popes Supremacy, Pag. 314.

5. It is no proof of a *Diocesan Church*, to shew that a Town, besides the Clergy or Officers in it, had some Presbyters or Congregations in the Countrey belonging to it. The instances which signifie no more, or not so much, are produced as sufficient arguments to prove

prove there were ſuch Churches. As that of *Gaius Diddenſis Presbyter*, ſuppoſed (with what ground I examine not) to have been a Countrey Presbyter belonging to *Carthage*, and under *Cyprian*. *m* And that of *Felix* ſaid to do the Office of a Presbyter, under *Decimus* another Presbyter; a thing unheard of in thoſe times, but let us take it as we find it, and upon the very ſlender reaſon alledged againſt *Goulartius* (who is of another Judgment) believe, that he was a Prieſt in ſome Village belonging to *Caldonius* his Dioceſe. *n* And that order for the Presbyters from their Churches, *to repair* to *their proper Biſhop for Chriſm* in *Africa*, *o* in *Spain*, *p* and in *France*. *q* To theſe are added, for further evidences, the Churches (ſaid without ground to be *many*,) belonging to *Hippo Diæritorum*; Alſo the Church of *Thyana*, belonging to *Alypius* Biſhop of *Tageſta*, which without reaſon, we muſt take to be a conſiderable City, *r* and the City *Milevis*, becauſe *Petilian* ſayes *Tunca* belonged to it once, though now it had a Biſhop of its own; and by our Authors Art of computation, *Towns*, *Villages* and *Cities* muſt belong to *Milevis*, upon the ſole account of *Tunca*, ſometime appertaining to it, *ſ* and theſe with *Fuſſala*, (of which before) are the chief inſtances to prove that *Africa* had very large *Dioceſes not inferiour to thoſe of ours, in extent of Territory*. *t* Beſides in the Council of *Neocæſarea* *Countrey Presbyters* are diſtinguiſhed from others; *u* and that of *Antioch* provides that *Countrey Presbyters ſhall not give Canonical Epiſtles*, *w* and allows the Biſhop to *order his own Church*, and the *Countrey places depending on it*. *x* And *Epiphanius* ſpeaks of a Church belonging to his charge, which we muſt underſtand to be his *Dioceſe*, though in the paſſage cited, it is twice called his *Province*, *y* in fine, *Jerome* ſpeakes of ſome baptized by Presbyters or Deacons

m *Vindication.* p. 504.

n *Pag.* 506. 507.

o *Con.* 4. *Can.* 36.

p *Tol.* 1. *Cap.* 20.

q *Vaſcon. Can.* 3.

r *Pag.* 527.

ſ *Pag.* 528.

t *Pag.* 516.

u *Can.* 13.

w *Can.* 8.

x *Can.* 9. *Pag.* 536.

y *Pag.* 555.

cons in *Hamlets*, *Caſtles*, and *Places remote from the Biſhop*.

Theſe and ſuch like are uſed as good arguments for *Dioceſan Churches*, whereas there are diverſe Towns in *England*, which beſides the Officers in them, have *many* Congregations and Presbyters in Villages belonging to them, and contained within the Pariſh; and yet our Author and thoſe of his perſwaſion would think *Dioceſans* quite ruined, if they were reduced, and confined to the meaſures of thoſe Pariſh Churches, and left no bigger than ſome of our Vicarages and Parſonages, though ſuch as Mr. *Hooker* affirms to *be as large as ſome antient Biſhopricks*; he might have ſaid *moſt*, there being not one in many greater or ſo large. I yet ſee no ground in antiquity, nor can expect to have it proved, that the larger ſort of ordinary Biſhopricks in the *fourth age*, and ſometime after, were of more extent than two ſuch Vicarages would be, if united. Yet a Biſhop of ſuch a Diſtrict in our times would be counted ſo far from having a *competent Dioceſe*, that he would ſcarce eſcape from being ſcorned as an *Italian Epiſcopellus*.

But his greateſt argument, (in compariſon of which his other Allegations, he tells us, are but *accidental hints*, z.) which he moſt inſiſts on, and offers many times over; ſo that it makes a great part of his diſcourſe on this ſubject. *a* It is drawn from the *number of Biſhops in Councils*, by which he would evince the *largeneſs* of antient *Dioceſes*, when it no way proves *Dioceſan* Churches of any ſize. He proceeds upon this ſuppoſition that *there were great numbers of Chriſtians in all parts and Cities*, b *in the firſt age: And that the Biſhops were fewer in former times than afterwards.* The former part of his *Hypotheſis*, if he underſtands the numbers of Chriſtians to be any thing comparable to what they

z *Pag.* 508.

a *Pag.* 508. *to Pag.* 555. *to* 539. *Pag.* 556. *to* 562.

b *Pag.* 530.

they were after *Constantine*, when Bishops were much multiplied; (as he must understand it, if he expect any service from it) wants proof, and he offers none but some passages in *Tertullian*, strained far beyond what is agreeable to other *antient Authors*, of which before. Let me add that *Nazianzen* comparing the numbers of Christians in former times, with those in *Julian*'s Reign, says, they were *not many* in former Persecutions, (Christianity had not reached many, οὔπω ἐπὶ πόλλους,) no, not in that of *Dioclesian*, &c. (though they were at that time, farr more numerous, than in *Tertullian*'s age) but
c Orat. 3. that Christianity was found only in a few ἐν ὀλίγοις c. The *other part* which needs no proof, since it is granted, (and may be without any advantage to him) he attempts to prove largely and industriously; but by such a *medium* as makes that which is granted to be questionable, such a one which as it is ordered may conclude backward, and prove the contrary to what he designs. That this may be manifest, let it be observed, that he will have us take an account of the number of Bishops in the Church by their appearing in *Councils*, more or fewer; and accordingly judge in several periods, whether they were less numerous, and consequently their Dioceses larger in former times than afterwards. And to this purpose we need view no other instances than himself produces. At *Lambese* in *Africa* there were 90 Bishops against *Privatus*; but not so many in any Council after (though not a few are mentioned in that
d pag. 509. Countrey) till the *Donatists* grew numerous *d*. In *Spain* the Council of *Eliberis* had 19 Bishops in the beginning of the 4th. Age, and the first Council of *Toledo* had no more in the beginning of the age after. But the following Synods, at *Saragossa*, *Gerunda*, *Ilerda*,
e pag. 557. 558 *Valentia*, *Arragon*, had not so many *e*. In *France* the Council at *Valence* had 21 Bishops in the fourth Age, but

but those following them, in that and the after ages had still fewer, *viz.* That of *Riez*, *Orange*, the third of *Arles*, that at *Angers*, that at *Tours*, and *Vennes* and another at *Arles*. For *General* Councils, the first at *Nice* had 318 Bishops in the beginning of the fourth Age, that at *Ephesus* above an hundred years after, had but two hundred, that at *C. P.* in the latter end of the fourth Age had but one hundred and fifty Bishops.

So that if we take account how many Bishops there were of old, as he would have us, by *their numbers in Councils*, there will be more before the middle of the third Age, than in the beginning of the fourth; more in the beginning of the fourth than in some part of the fifth; and more in the beginning of the fifth, than in some part of the sixth; quite contrary to the *Hypothesis* on which he proceeds. Whether by his argument he would lead us to think *Dioceses* did wax and wane so odly, as it makes Bishops to be more or fewer, I cannot tell. However since he grants that in the fourth and fifth Ages *Dioceses* were *very small* f, and *crumbled into small pieces* g, (and so nothing like ours): there's no expectation he can find any larger, if any thing near so great, in any former age: unless they can be larger when incomparably fewer Christians belonged to these Bishops; which will be no less a paradox than the former. For it cannot but be thought strange, that the Bishops Diocese should be *greater* when his flock was undeniably far *less*. And they seem not to be *Christian Bishopricks*, whose measures must be taken by numbers of *Acres* rather than of *Souls*; or by multitudes of Heathens rather than Christians.

f pag. 552.
g pag. 516.

He denies not, that *the generality of Bishops, for a long while after the Apostles*, had *but one Congregation to Govern*. What then? says he, *If all the Beleivers in and* Pag. 71.

about a City would hardly make a Congregation, that is to be aſcribed to the condition of thoſe times. Dioceſes with him, were largeſt in the firſt times; but Biſhops being ſtill multiplyed, they became leſs and leſs, and ſo were very ſmall and crumbled into very little pieces in the fourth and fifth Ages. This is the tendency of his diſcourſe all along. Thus Dioceſes muſt be largeſt, when a Biſhop had but one Congregation; but in after ages when he had more Congregations under his inſpection Dioceſes were very ſmall. If he will ſtand to this, our differences may be eaſily compromized. Let him and thoſe of his perſwaſion, be content with the Dioceſes in the firſt ages, when he counts them largeſt; and we ſhall never trouble any to reduce them to the meaſures of the fourth and fifth ages, when in his account they were ſo lamentably *little*, and *crumbled ſo very ſmall.*

The particulars premiſed contain enough to ſatisfie *all*, that I have yet ſeen alledged out of Antiquity for *Dioceſan Churches*, ſo that no more is needful, yet let me add another, which will ſhew there is a *medium* between *Congregational* and *Dioceſan* Churches. So that if ſome Churches ſhould be ſhewed out of the *Antients* exceeding the *Congregational meaſures* (as ſome there were in the times of the four firſt General Councils) yet it cannot thence be immediately inferred that they were *Dioceſan*, ſince they may prove a *third* ſort of Churches, and ſuch as will as little pleaſe thoſe of this Gentleman's perſwaſion as *Congregational.*

6. It's no argument for a *Dioceſan* Church, that there were ſeveral fixed Churches, with their proper Presbyters in a City or its Territory; ſo long as theſe Churches, how many ſoever were *governed in common* by the Biſhop and Presbyters in ſuch a Precinct. For though few inſtances can be given of ſuch Churches, in or be-

belonging to a City in the 4th. Age; yet wherever they were extant in that, or the following Age, in things of *common concern* to those Churches, they were ordered in common by a Presbytery, that is, the Bishop with the Presbyters of that Precinct. *Jerome* declares it *de jure, they ought to be governed in common, in communi debere Ecclesiam regere.* *h*

h *In Titus* 1.

And *Felix* 3 Bishop of *Rome*, (than whom no Bishop was higher, or more absolute in those times,) declares it *de facto*, when he speaks of the Presbyters of that Church, as διεπόντων μετ' ἐμὲ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον, *ruling that Church with him.* It is the same word that the governing of Churches by other Bishops, is expressed by μὴ πάσης τῶν ἐπισκόπων οἱ τὰς πέριξ διέπον ἐκκλησίας γνώμης, as *Alexander* saith of *Narcissus*, ὁ περὶ ἐμὲ διέπων τὸν τόπον ἐπισκοπῆς. *i* It imports no less than *præsidere*, and is ascribed to Bishops and Presbyters, jointly by *Tertullian*, *k* *Cyprian* *l* and *Firmilian*. *m* Hence the Presbyters are frequently said to be συλλειτουργοὶ with the Bishop, *n* for then the Governing power of Bishops was but counted a *Ministry*, λειτουργίας γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ὄνομα δηλοτικὸν, *o* and the Presbyters *fellow Ministers* with him, and joint Administrators in the Government. They are styled συμποιμένες, *p* *fellow Pastors*, they did not then dream that a Bishop was *sole Pastor* of many Churches. They are also called συνέδρεύται, which is no less than συνθρονοι, *q* for the Presbyters had their *Thrones* with the Bishop. So *Nazianzen* speaks of *Basil* when ordained Presbyter, as promoted ἱερεῖς θρόνους *to the Sacred Thrones of the Presbyters.* *r* They are also called συνέχοντες or κοινοὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς. *s*

i *Euseb. l. 6. c. 11.*
k *Apol. c. 39.*
l *Lib. 1. Ep. 3.*
m *Ep. 75.*
n *Theod. Hist. l. 4. c. 8. Epiphan. Her. 42.*
o *Isidore Lib. 4. Ep. 260.*
p *Naz. Orat. 1. Orat. 7.*
q *Ignat. ad Tral in Chrysost. Tom 7. Hom. ζ. a.*
r *Orat. 20.*
s *Chryf. in Tim. Hom. 1.*

But further evidence is needless, though abundance may be produced, since the great *Patrons* of Episco-

pacy seems not to question it, that the *Church was governed in common*, and the Bishop was to do nothing of importance without the Presbyters, it is acknowledged by Bishop *Bilson*, *t* Bishop *Downham*, *u* Bishop *Hall* asserts it, as *that which is Universally accorded by all antiquity, that all things in the antient Church were ordered and transacted by the general consent of Presbyters.* *w* Mr. *Thorndike* proves at large, *that the Government of Churches passed in common*; *x* Primate *Usher* more succinctly but effectually. *y* Add but Dr. *St.* who both asserts and proves it, *z there was still one Ecclesiastical Senate, which ruled all the several Congregations of those Cities in common, of which the several Presbyters of the Congregations were Members, and in which the Bishop acted as the President of the Senate, for the better Governing the affairs of the Church*, &c.

t *Perpet Govern. Cap.* 11.
u *Defence. lib.* 3. *L.* 1. *c.* 8.
w *Iren. P.* 47.
x *Prim. Govern.*
y *Reduct. of Episcopacy.*
z *Iren. Pag.* 354. 355. 356.

Let me add, when the Churches were so multiplyed in City and Territory, as that it was requisite to divide them into Parishes, and constitute several Churches; the Bishop was not the *proper Ruler* or *Pastor* of the whole Precinct, and the Churches in it, or of any Church, but *one*. The Parishes or Churches were divided among Presbyters and Bishop, they had their several distinct cures and charges; the Bishops peculiar charge was the *Ecclesia principalis*, the chief Parish or Church so called, or ἀνδεντικὴ καθέδρα. The Presbyters performed all Offices in their several *Cures*, and ordered all affairs which did particularly concern the Churches where they were incumbents; those that were of more common concern were ordered by Bishop and Presbyters together, and thus it was in the Bishops Church or Parish, he performed all Offices, administred all Ordinances of Worship himself, or by Presbyters joyned with him, as Assistants. He was to attend this *particular cure* constantly, he was not allowed to be absent

sent, no, not under pretence of taking care for some other Church; if he had any business there which particularly concerned him, he was to make quick dispatch, and not (χρονίζειν καὶ ἀμελεῖν τῶν οἰκείων λαῶν, as *Zonaras*) *stay there with the neglect of his proper flock*; this is all evident by a Canon of the Council of *Carthage a*, *Rursum placuit ut nemini sit facultas, relicta principali Cathedra, ad aliquam Ecclesiam in Dioceſi constitutam se conferre, vel in re propria, diutius quam oportet constitutum, curam vel frequentationem propriæ Cathedræ negligere.* Of this Church or Parish he was the proper Pastor or Ruler, called there ἰδιος ἐπίσκοπος, and elsewhere *b* οἰκεῖα καθέδρα, in contradistinction to other parts of the Precinct, called here Dioceses; and the people of it are called οἰκεῖος λαὸς by the ancient *Canonist c*, his *proper flock or people*, his own special charge. This was the particular Church under his personal Government, but he was not Ruler of the Precinct, or any other Churches in it, save only in *common*, and in conjunction with the other Presbyters; who jointly took cognizance of what in his Church or theirs, was of greater or more general consequence, and concerned the whole, and gave order in it by *common consent*.

a In Zonar. N. 77 in Code 71.

b Can. 53.

c Zonar. in loc.

And while this was the *form of Government*, if there had been as many Churches there, thus associated, as *Optatus* in the fourth age says there was at *Rome*, or far more, they could not make a *Diocesan* Church, unless a *Diocesan* and a *Presbyterian* Church be all one. For this is plainly a *Presbyterian* Church, the *antient Presbyteries* differing from the *modern* but in a matter of smaller moment. In those their *President* being *fixed* and constant, in these commonly though not always *circular*. The Presbyteries in *Scotland* comprized some twelve, some twenty, some more Churches, their

in reason be denied them; but this the antients ascribe to them; So *Jerome*, *n Mihi ante Presbyterum sedere non licet, illi si peccavero licet me tradere Satanæ ad interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit.* *Chrysostome* threatned some of his Auditory, while he was a Presbyter, to Excommunicate them, ἐπαρρησίαν λοίπον ὑμῖν τῶν ἱερῶν τέτων ὄντων ἀπέχεσθαι παθόντων, *o* to wave all of like nature insisted on by others; *Justinian* in the 6th. Age signifies plainly, that not only *Bishops*, but *Presbyters* might Excommunicate Offenders, in his *Constitutions* he forbids Bishops and *Presbyters to exclude any from Communion, till such cause was declared, for which the Canons appointed it to be done,* πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἀπαγορεύομεν, ἀφορίζειν τινὰ τῆς ἁγίας κοινωνίας, &c. and will have the sentence of *Excommunication rescinded, which was passed by Bishops or Presbyters without cause.* *p* In the *Code* both Bishops and Clergy are forbid to Excommunicate in certain cases, and then mentions the cases for which they must not, ἢ ἀφορίζειν ἢ ἀναθεματίζειν —— καὶ ἔθος τοῦτον ἐκράτησεν, *although they had been accustomed to it.* *q*

n Ad Heliodorum.

o Hom. 17. in Matth.

p Novel. 123. c. 11.

q Lex 39, Sec. 2. Tit. de Episc. & Clericis.

Now while Presbyters had *this power* there could be no *Dioceſan Churches*, whether they exerciſed it in *common*, as was ſhewed before, or *particularly* in their ſeveral Churches, as will now be made apparent; For by virtue of theſe powers the Presbyters were really Biſhops, though they had not alwayes the Title, yea, they are called Biſhops, as a *Learned Prelatiſt* obſerves, by the antienteſt Authors, *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, *r* and have frequently the *Names* and *Titles* which ſome would appropriate to Biſhops, and which the Fathers uſe to expreſs the Office of Biſhops by, πρωτοστάτες *Præpoſiti*, *Antiſtites*, *Præſidentes*, *ſ* &c. And ſo there was as many *Biſhops* really in every Dioceſe, as there were particular Churches and Presbyters there; And well may

r Thorn. Prim. Govern. Pag. 73. 74.

ſ Idem. ſervice. Pag. 68.

may they be ſaid to be really the ſame, ſince they were of the very *ſame Office*; for Biſhops in the antient Church, were not a *ſuperiour Order* to Presbyters, but had only a Precedency in the ſame *Order*. This ſome of the moſt judicious and learned *Defenders* of Epiſcopacy aſſert. And thoſe who hold that *Patriarchs*, *Metropolitans* and *Biſhops* differed not in *Order*, but in *degree* only, which is the common opinion of *Epiſcopal Divines*, and yet contend that Biſhops and Presbyters were of a *different order*, will never be able to prove it. The difference they aſſign between *Biſhops* and *Metropolitans* is, that theſe *preſided in Synods, and had a principal intereſt in Ordinations*, and what more did the preeminence of antient Biſhops, diſtinguiſhing them from Presbyters amount to? It conſiſted in nothing material but their *preſidency* in Presbyteries, and their power in Ordinations. This laſt is moſt inſiſted on, as making the difference wider, between theſe than the other. But with little reaſon all things conſidered. For thoſe to be ordained, were firſt to be examined and approved by the Presbyters, μὴ ἄλλως χειροτονείσθωσαν ἀλλὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων κληρικῶν δοκιμαζόντων *t*, the ordaining of one to the Presbytery was to be ψηφῷ καὶ κρίσει τοῦ κλήρου παντὸς *u*. It was a crime for which the greateſt Biſhop in the World was cenſurable, to preferr any, or make Ordinations παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ κλήρου, as appears by what *Chryſoſtome* was accuſed of, though it is like falſly *w*, and this is counted by ſome the *ſubſtance* of Ordination, wherein the Presbyters had no leſs ſhare (to ſay no more) than the Biſhop. And in *impoſing hands*, which was the *Rite of Ordaining*, the Presbyters were to concurr with the Biſhop, for which there is better Authority than the Canon of an *African* Council, for ſaith a very learned *Doctor x, to this purpoſe, the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery* y, *is no ways impertinently alledged, although*

t *Theophilus Commonitor. cap. 6.*
u *Clem. Conſtitut. lib. 8. cap. 18.*
w *Phot. in Chryſ. Tom. 8. pag. 155. Concil. Carth. 4. cap. 22. Turon. 2.*
x *Iren. p. 275.*
y 1 *Tim.* 1. 1

 we

we suppose St. Paul *to concurr in the action; because if the Presbytery had nothing to do in the Ordination, to what purpose were their hands laid upon him? Was it only to be Witnesses of the fact, or to signifie their consent? Both these might have been, done without their use of that Ceremony, which will scarce be instanced in, to be done by any but such, as had power to conferr what was signifyed by that Ceremony.* And diverse instances are brought by the *same hand* to shew that Ordinations by Presbyters was *valid* in the antient Church z.

z pag. 379.

But if the Presbyters had been quite excluded from *Ordination*, and this power had been intirely reserved to the Bishops, yet this would not be sufficient to constitute them a *superiour Order.* For the Rite of Ordaining was so farr from being an act of *Government* or jurisdiction, that it did not inferre any *superiority* in the Ordainer; nothing being more ordinary in the practice of the Antient Church, than for those were of a *lower Degree* and Station, to Ordain their Superiours.

While there was no more distance betwixt Bishop and Presbyters but only in *Degree*, so that as the Bishop was but *primus* Presbyter, (as *Hilary* under the name of *Ambrose*, and others *a*; or *Primicerius* as *Optatus*, defined by a Learned Civilian to be πρώτον τῆ τάξεως) *b the first Presbyter*, so the Presbyter was a second Bishop ἐν δευτέροις θρόνοις, as *Nazianzen.* As the *Bishop* was *summus sacerdos*, in the style of *Tertullian* and others, that is, *cheif Presbyter*, so the Presbyter was *Bishop* a *degree* lower; not that he had less *pastoral power*, but because he wanted that *degree* of dignity or preeminence, for which the other was styled *chief.* As the *Præter Urbanus* was called *Maximus*, yet he had

a In 1 Tim. Autor. Quest. in V. et N. T.
b Gothofrid. in Code.

had no more *Power* than the other, *Prætorum idem erat collegium, eadem poteſtas* c, but only ſome more privi- ledge and dignity, *dignitate cæteros anteibat propterea maximus dicebatur* d, and the ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος, at *Athens* was *Prætor maximus*, yet all the reſt were *pares poteſtate* e; *Biſhops* and Presbyters had *idem miniſterium* as *Jerome*, *eadem Ordinatio*, as *Hilary* f, they were of the ſame *Order* and Office, had the ſame power, *the power of the Keys*, all that which the *Scripture* makes eſſential to a *Biſhop*. While it was thus, there could be no *Dioceſan Churches*, that is, no Churches conſiſting of many Congregations which had but *one Biſhop* only.

c *Bodin. lib.* 3. *c.* 6.

d *Feſt. in verb. major.*

e *Ibid.*

f *In* 1 *Tim.* 3.

POST-SCRIPT.

A Late Writer presumes he has detected a notable mistake in the *Author*, of *No Evidence for Dioceſan Churches* (ascribed to one who owns it not) about μύριοι, which I suppose he would have Translated *Ten Thousands definitely*; but there it is rendred *indefinitely thousands*, as we are wont to expres a great many, when the precise number is not known. Those who understand the Language, and have observed the *use* of the Word, will be farr from counting this a fault: and those who view the passage will count it intolerable, to render it as that Gentleman would have it. That of *Atticus* Bishop of *C. P.* may satisfie any concerning the import and use of the word, who sending mony for the releif of the poor at *Nice* to *Calliopius*, he thus writes,

writes, ἔμαθον μυρίους ἐν τῇ πόλει πεινῶντας δεῖσθαι παρὰ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἐλέου. Μυρίους δὲ λέγω τὸ πλῆθος, οὐ τὴν ἀκριβῆ δηλῶν ἀριθμόν. where he tells him that by μυρίους he understands a multitude whose number he did not exactly know, thus (i. e. indefinitely) is the word most frequently used by Greek Writers, and particularly by *Eusebius* the Author of the passage cited. So he tells us, *Nero* killed his *Mother*, his *Brothers*, his *Wife*, σὺν ἄλλοις μυρίοις, of her Kindred: And *Timotheus* of *Gaza*, he says, indured μυρίας βασάνους. Many more might be added, where the word is not rendred by the best Translators (*Valesius* particularly) ten thousand; but still indefinitly *innumerabiles* or *infiniti*, or *sexcenti*, &c. Nor have I met with one instance (though possibly there may be some) in him where it is used to express ten thousand precisely.

Hist. l. 2. c.

l. 8. c. 13.

However it had been an unpardonable injury to *Eusebius*, to have rendred it so in this place; as if he would have deluded the World with a most palpable untruth, which both he, and all men acquainted with the state of the Church in those times, know to be so. For this make him say that ten thousand Bi-

shops

ſhops met in Councel at *Antioch* in the third Age; when as he never knew a Synod of ſix hundred Biſhops in the fourth Age, while he lived; though then Biſhops were farr more numerous, and had all encouragement to meet in greateſt numbers. This makes him ſignifie, that ten thouſand Biſhops aſſembled in the skirts of the *Eaſt part* of the *Empire*: When as their was not near ſo many (this Gentleman is concerned to maintain there was not *one thouſand*) in the *whole* Chriſtian World.

This is more than enough to ſhew that there is ſufficient warrant to Tranſlate μύριοι, *Thouſands* more than once; though that it is in that diſcourſe (which he ſtiles *a little Pamphlet*) ſo tranſlated more then once, is another of his miſtakes. And a *third* (all in two lines) is that the Author grounds his Argument on it. Whereas thoſe that view the paſſage, and the occaſion of it, will ſee it had been more for his advantage to have tranſlated it *ten thouſands*. He that can allow himſelf to write at this rate, may eaſily be voluminous, and look too big to be deſpiſed, as a writer of *little Pamphlets*. The

The Letter *mentioned* pag. 45. *being communicated to me by* M. B. *that part of it which concerns* Alexandria *is here added, that it may appear how much it is mistaken, and how farr from being answered.*

For *Alexandria* it was the greatest City in the Empire next to *Rome*, μεγίστη μετὰ τὴν Ῥωμὴν ἡ πόλις, says *Josephus de bello Judaic lib.* 5. *c. ult.* And *Epiphanius* gives an account of many Churches in it assigned to several Presbyters, *viz.* besides *Cæsarea* finished by *Athanasius*, that of *Dionysius*, *Theonas*, *Pierius*, *Serapion*, *Perseas*, *Dizia*, *Mundidius*, *Annianus*, *Baucalas*, adding καὶ ἄλλαι. *Hæres* 69. *page* 728: This notwithstanding that the Christians at *Alexandria* which held Communion with *Athanasius*, might and did meet together in one Church, he himself declares expresly in his Apology to *Constantius*, *page* 531. *Tom.* 1. *Edit. Commelin. Anno* 1601. The whole passage is too large to transcribe or translate, this is the sence of it. He being accused for assembling the People in the great Church before it was dedicated (περὶ αὐτῶν τελειωθῶσι) makes this part of his defence. 'The 'confluence of the People at the Paschal solem-

nity

'nity was so great that if they had met in seve-
'ral assemblies (κατὰ μέρος καὶ διηρημένως) the other
'Churches were so little and strait, that they
'would have been in danger of suffering by
'the crowd, nor would the universal harmo-
'ny and concurrence of the People have been
'so visible and effectual, if they had met in
'parcels. Therefore he appeals to him, whe-
'ther it was not better for the whole multi-
'tude to meet in that great Church (being a
'place large enough to receive them altogether
'ὄντος ἤδη τόπου τοῦ δυναμένου δέξασθαι πάντας, ἐν αὐτῷ συνελθεῖν,) and
'to have a concurrence of all the people with
'one voice (καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν μετὰ συμφωνίας τῶν λαῶν γίνεσθαι τὴν
'φωνήν.) For if says he according to our Savi-
'viours promise, where two shall agree as
'touching any thing, it shall be done for them
'of my Father, &c. How prevalent will be
'the one voice of so numerous a People assem-
'bled together and saying *Amen* to God? Who
'therefore would not wonder, who would not
'count it a happiness, to see so great a People
'met together in one place? And how did the
'people rejoice to behold one another, where-
'as formerly they assembled in several places?

Hereby it is evident that in the middle of the fourth Age, all the Christians at *Alexan-*

dria which were wont at other times to meet in several assemblies, were no more than one Church might and did contain, so as they could all join at once in the Worship of God and concurre in one *Amen.*

He tells him also that *Alexander* his Predecessor, (who died *An.* 325) did as much as he in like circumstances, *viz.* assembled the whole multitude in one Church before it was dedicated, *pag.* 532.

This seems clear enough, but being capable of another kind of proof which may be no less satisfactory, let me add that also. This City was by *Strabo* his description of it, χλαμυδοειδὴς τὸ σχῆμα, like a Soldiers Coat, whose length at either side was almost 30 Furlongs, its breadth at either end 7 or 8 Furlongs, *Geogr. lib.* 17. *pag.* 546. so the whole compass will be less than ten Miles. A third or fourth part of this was taken up with publick Buildings, Temples, and Royal Palaces, ἔχει τε ἡ πόλις τεμένη, τά τε κοινὰ καὶ ἴδια καὶ βασίλεια, τέταρτον, ἢ καὶ τρίτον τῆς παντὸς περιβόλου μέρος. *ibid.* two Miles and half or three and a quarter is thus disposed of. I take this to be that Region of the City which *Epiphanius* calls ἐρέχθιον, (where he tells us, was the famous Library of *Ptolomeus Philadelphus*) and speaks of

of it in his time as destitute of Inhabitants, ἔρημον τινῶν ἐνπάρχον, *de Ponder. & mensur, n. 9. p. 166* A great part of the City was assigned to the Jews, πόλεως ἀφώρισο μεγα μέρος τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ. So *Strabo* indefinitely, as *Josephus* quotes him. *Antiquit. Jud. l. 14. c. 12.* Others tells us more punctually, their share was two of the five divisions (*Ushers Annals Latin, pag.* 859.) Though many of them had their habitation in the other divisions, yet they had two fifth parts entire to themselves, and this is (I suppose) the τόπος ἴδιος which *Josephus* saith, the Successors of *Alexander* set apart for them (αὐτοῖς ἀφώρισαν, *bello Jud. l. 2. cap. 21.* Thus we see already how 6 or 7 miles of the 10 were taken up. The greatest part of the Citizens (as at *Rome* and other Cities) in the beginning of the 4th. Age were Heathens. Otherwise *Antonius* wrong'd the City, who, in *Athanasius*'s time, is brought in thus exclaiming by *Jerom. vit. Paul. p.* 243. *Væ tibi Alexandria quæ pro Deo portenta veneraris; væ tibi civitas meretrix in quam totius orbis dæmonia confluxere*, &c. a Charge thus formed, supposes the prevailing party to be guilty. But let us suppose them equal, and their proportion half of the 3 or 4 miles remaining, Let the rest be divided amongst the Orthodox, the *Arrians*,

the

the *Novatians* and other Sects: And if we be just a large part will fall to the share of Hereticks and Sectaries. For not to mention others, the *Novatians* had several Churches and a Bishop there, till *Cyrils* time, *vid. Socrat. Hist. l. 7. c. 7.* The *Arians* were a great part of those who professed Christianity, τῷ λαῷ ἐκ ὀλίγου μοῖρα, (*Sozom. Hist. l. 1. c. 14.*) and if we may judge of the followers by their leaders, no loss than half. For whereas there were 19 Presbyters and Deacons in that Church (*Theod. Hist. l. 4. c. 23.*) (12 was the number of their Presbyters by their Antient Constitution, as appears by *Eutychius*, and 7 their Deacons, as at *Rome*, and elsewhere) 6 Presbyters with *Arius*, and 5 Deacons fell off from the Catholicks. *Sozom. Hist. l. 1. c. 14.* But let the *Arians* be much fewer, yet will not the proportion of the Catholick Bishops Diocese in this City, be more than that of a small Town, one of 8 or 12 Furlongs in compass. And so the numbers of the Christians upon this account, will be no more than might well meet for Worship in one place.

FINIS.

(in Mcat)

Date Due

Demco 38-297